





Bulletin
of
The American Association
of
University Professors

Editor

Ralph E. Himstead

Editorial Committee

Joseph Allen

E. C. Kirkland

Fernandus Payne

Paul W. Ward

Publication Office: 20th and Northampton Sts., Easton, Pa.

Editorial Office: 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

Issued bimonthly in February, April, June, October, and December. Subscription price (due and payable in advance) is \$3.00 a year, postage free. Foreign subscriptions (including Canada) are \$3.50 a year.

Entered as second-class matter, April 24, 1922, at the Post Office at Easton, Pa., under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

OFFICERS AND THE COUNCIL

PRESIDENT

MARK H. INGRAHAM (*Mathematics*) University of Wisconsin

VICE-PRESIDENTS

ALZADA COMSTOCK (*Economics*) Mount Holyoke College
A. C. KREY (*History*) University of Minnesota

GENERAL SECRETARY

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD (*Law*) Washington Office

ASSOCIATE SECRETARY

PAUL W. WARD (*Philosophy*) Washington Office

TREASURER

FLORENCE P. LEWIS (*Mathematics*) Goucher College

TERM MEMBERS

1937-1939

WILLIAM R. ARTHUR (*Law*) University of Colorado
J. B. BULLITT (*Pathology*) University of North Carolina
L. A. DOGGETT (*Electrical Engineering*) Pennsylvania State College
D. G. FOSTER (*Chemistry*) Swarthmore College
A. N. HOLCOMBE (*Government*) Harvard University
SIDNEY HOOK (*Philosophy*) New York University
ROBERT E. MATHEWS (*Law*) Ohio State University
DR SCOTT (*Economics*) University of Missouri
S. STEPHENSON SMITH (*English*) University of Oregon
WILLIS G. SWARTZ (*Political Science*) Illinois State Normal University (Southern)

1938-1940

HENRY K. BENSON (*Chemistry*) University of Washington
GEORGE BOAS (*Philosophy*) Johns Hopkins University
WALTER G. CADY (*Physics*) Wesleyan University
ARTHUR C. COLE (*History*) Western Reserve University
WILLIAM MCGUFFEY HEPBURN (*Law*) University of Alabama
E. J. LUND (*Zoology*) University of Texas
GEORGE C. ROBINSON (*Government*) Iowa State Teachers College
EUNICE MORGAN SCHENCK (*French*) Bryn Mawr College
T. V. SMITH (*Philosophy*) University of Chicago
COLSTON E. WARNE (*Economics*) Amherst College

1939-1941

BLANCHE H. DOW (*French*) Missouri State Teachers College (Northwest)
HORACE N. GILBERT (*Economics*) California Institute of Technology
HORACE M. GRAY (*Economics*) University of Illinois
CHARLES B. HALE (*English*) University of Maryland
VICTOR D. HILL (*Classical Languages*) Ohio University
H. M. HOSFORD (*Mathematics*) University of Arkansas
ERNEST F. LANGLEY (*Romance Languages*) Massachusetts Institute of Technology
EVERETT V. STONEQUIST (*Sociology*) Skidmore College
G. SAFFORD TORREY (*Botany*) Connecticut State College
EARL L. VANCE (*Journalism*) Florida State College for Women

EX-PRESIDENTS

W. W. COOK (*Law*) Northwestern University
S. A. MITCHELL (*Astronomy*) University of Virginia
A. J. CARLSON (*Physiology*) University of Chicago

CONTENTS

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE—JOHN B. STETSON UNIVERSITY.....	377
CONCERNING ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE, <i>W. C. Allee</i>	400
CONTRIBUTORS.....	407
FREEDOM AND TENURE: THE PROFESSION'S OWN PART, <i>Earl L. Vance</i>	408
SELECTION AND RETENTION OF FACULTY MEMBERS, <i>E. H. Sturtevant</i>	414
THE ACADEMIC PROCESS IN A CHANGING WORLD, <i>F. R. Aumann</i>	422
REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND POLICY...	429
REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE.....	437
ASSOCIATION NEWS	
Annual Meeting.....	440
Washington Office.....	440
Announcement.....	441
Membership Records.....	442
Representatives.....	442
Regional Meetings.....	443
Aberdeen, South Dakota.....	443
Gainesville, Florida.....	443
Hamilton, New York.....	444
New York City.....	446
Normal, Illinois.....	447
Chapter Activities.....	447
Indiana University.....	447
Michigan State College.....	448
Purdue University.....	448
Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas.....	448
University of Wyoming.....	449

EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION	
Congress on Education for Democracy.....	450
College Management, <i>William H. Kilpatrick</i>	455
REVIEWS	
Preparation of School Personnel, New York Regents' Inquiry.....	461
Doctor's Oral, <i>George R. Stewart</i>	464
A Short History of Political Thinking, <i>Paul W. Ward</i> ...	466
Publications Received.....	467
COUNCIL RECORD.....	470
EDITORIAL, <i>Mark H. Ingraham</i>	483
CENSURED ADMINISTRATIONS.....	485
MEMBERSHIP.....	486
ACADEMIC VACANCIES AND TEACHERS AVAILABLE.....	495

ANNUAL MEETING

New Orleans, Louisiana

Jung Hotel

December 27-28

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE

JOHN B. STETSON UNIVERSITY

On March 2, 1938, Associate Professor Henry S. Jacobs, since 1933 successively instructor, assistant professor, and associate professor in the College of Law of the John B. Stetson University, De Land, Florida, was notified that his annual contract would not be renewed at the end of the academic year 1937-1938. On April 8, similar notice was given to Professor Jennis W. Futch, and on April 12 to Professor Jacob A. Carpenter. Both Professor Futch and Professor Carpenter had served on the Stetson University faculty in their respective ranks for thirteen years. Professors Jacobs and Carpenter were afforded an opportunity to and did teach in the 1938 summer school at the customary salary of \$250. No other compensation or notice was given them.

At about the time Professors Carpenter and Futch were notified of their discharge, Lewis H. Tribble was replaced as dean of the College of Law by Paul E. Raymond. Mr. Raymond was the fifth member of a faculty which then consisted of himself and the four men previously named. Mr. Tribble retained his professorship and is not a complainant in this case.

Professors Jacobs, Futch, and Carpenter made their discharges the basis of complaints, first to the Executive Committee of the Association of American Law Schools and then to the American Association of University Professors. Preliminary inquiries were conducted by both associations in the spring of 1938. On May 11, President William S. Allen of Stetson University appeared in person before the Executive Committee of the Association of American Law Schools to show cause why that Association should not interest itself in the matter. The Executive Committee of the Association of American Law Schools referred the case to its Tenure Committee. Active correspondence took place between the two associations, the complainants, and the University. Late in June, 1938, Professor William E. Britton, Chairman of the

Tenure Committee of the Association of American Law Schools, furnished the seven other members of that Committee with copies of correspondence relating to the merits of the complaint. The members recommended to Professor Britton that an investigation should be made. Professor Britton conferred with the General Secretary of the American Association of University Professors and it was agreed that that Association should conduct the investigation rather than the Association of American Law Schools. He suggested that one or two of the three members of the investigating committee be members of the Tenure Committee of the Association of American Law Schools. This suggestion was acted upon. The committee appointed consisted of Professors James A. McLaughlin of the Harvard Law School, William M. Hepburn of the University of Alabama School of Law, and Lon L. Fuller of the Duke University School of Law. Professors McLaughlin and Hepburn, both members of the Tenure Committee of the Association of American Law Schools, have thus acted in a dual capacity. They have presented a more detailed report to the Executive Committee of the Association of American Law Schools.

Owing to vacation delays, the investigating committee was not formed and instructed to proceed until October 8, 1938. Correspondence looking to the earliest date practicable for the complainants, the University, and the committee members led to an investigation in De Land on November 11, 12, 13, and 14, 1938.

The afternoon of November 11, 1938, was devoted to hearing the testimony of the complainants, which was transcribed by a court reporter. Dr. William S. Allen, President of the University, declined an invitation to have a representative of the University's administration present at this hearing, which was held in a hotel room, stating that he did not consider the University on trial. The second day was devoted in the main to hearing the University's side of the controversy. The President designated Dean Raymond to present the University's case. Dean Raymond offered to the committee a twelve-page written statement which he had prepared, defending the action of the University. He was informed of the substance of the testimony of the complainants taken the day before, and his comments were transcribed. The committee then questioned President Allen.

In the evening, the administration of the University produced the keeper of a local boarding house, as one familiar with the reputation of the discharged professors among the students. This testimony was regarded by the committee as inconsequential. After this witness was heard, Professor Tribble was examined privately. This concluded the proceedings on November 12.

On Sunday morning, November 13, the committee met and questioned three members of the Administrative Committee of the Board of Trustees of the University.

After the morning of the 13th, the committee ceased to sit as a unit. The administration of the University and the complainants were requested to introduce members of the committee to informed persons, and in this manner the members of the committee carried on an informal investigation, involving interviews with a considerable number of persons. This report is based on findings of the investigating committee.

Facts Concerning Complainants—Notifications of Discharge

Henry S. Jacobs, born in 1891, received an A.B. degree from Wesleyan University in 1912, and an LL.B. from Yale in 1916. He was associated with Rockwood and Lark, attorneys, New York City, in 1916 and 1917. After the war he was for four years connected with the legal department of Famous Players-Lasky Corporation, where he was head of the contract division in charge of its contracts and leases. From 1924-1933 he was engaged in the real estate business in Florida. In 1933 he was appointed instructor in law at John B. Stetson University. He states that when he accepted this position he was told that if his work was satisfactory he would be advanced to a full professorship and receive the same salary as the other full professors in the College of Law. Each year thereafter his salary was raised, with the result that it was doubled by the academic year 1937-1938. In 1934 he was made an Assistant Professor. He was promoted to an Associate Professorship in 1935, his rank at the time of his dismissal.

In 1935 Mr. Raymond received an inquiry with respect to a

position at Mercer University. He replied that he was not interested, but referred Mercer to Mr. Jacobs as one who might be. Early in September, 1935, Mr. Jacobs received a telegram from the Law School at Mercer with respect to a position that involved a considerable advance in salary. Because of the late date and his obligation to Stetson University, he replied that he was not available.

Dr. William S. Allen came to John B. Stetson University as President in September, 1934, the beginning of Mr. Jacobs' second year there. Mr. Jacobs had his first conversation with President Allen concerning his prospects in April, 1936, when Mr. Jacobs received his "annual contract," issued yearly to each member of the teaching staff. This contract described his rank as that of instructor, an error later corrected by President Allen with the explanation that Mr. Jacobs was an associate professor. During the interview at which President Allen made this correction Mr. Jacobs stated that it was his understanding that he would be promoted to a full professorship in case his work was satisfactory. President Allen replied that he would have to obtain a more advanced degree before he could be promoted. Mr. Jacobs made inquiries concerning summer law schools, but later that spring President Allen asked him to stay at Stetson to teach during the coming summer session. Mr. Jacobs then asked President Allen about his need for additional degrees. President Allen advised him that he had ample time.

The vacancy on the Stetson summer faculty being otherwise filled, Mr. Jacobs asked Dean Tribble whether it was necessary for him to obtain further degrees. Dean Tribble replied that the value of further degrees was not apparent to him, but that Mr. Jacobs might profit from observing the methods of leading law teachers. Thereupon Professor Jacobs attended the summer school at Northwestern University Law School and studied under former Dean John H. Wigmore, Professor William E. Britton of the University of Illinois, and other well-known teachers, receiving three A's and one B in four courses. Mr. Tribble believes Mr. Jacobs benefited by this experience and that he otherwise showed consistent improvement as a teacher both before and after 1936.

President Allen testified that both he and Dean Tribble told

Mr. Jacobs to obtain a higher degree if he were to remain with the institution. Dean Tribble's testimony, however, agrees with that of Mr. Jacobs. Dean Tribble did not tell Mr. Jacobs that more degrees would be required for any purpose, much less that they would be required to remain with the institution.

In one of his letters Dr. Allen stated that he had discharged the three men because they were "very poor teachers" and that he had talked to Dean Tribble of the College of Law and to trustees about this matter and that they "agreed most heartily with his diagnosis." The assertion that the President had consulted Dean Tribble and the trustees the committee finds to be unfounded in fact. Dr. Allen first informed Dean Tribble of his decision to discharge Professors Jacobs and Futch on the morning of March 2, the day he notified Mr. Jacobs of his discharge. The brief interview which he had with Dean Tribble at that time was in no sense a consultation; he merely informed Dean Tribble of his determination. This much was virtually admitted by the President himself when he was examined by the committee. The three members of the Administrative Committee of the Board of Trustees could not recall having had any conversations with the President concerning these men prior to the annual meeting of the Committee, at which time the President informed them of the action he had already taken.

On March 2, when President Allen notified Mr. Jacobs of his discharge, he stated that he needed men with advanced degrees to draw outstanding students to the College of Law, mentioning certain students of low grade in the school. Mr. Jacobs replied that he was giving failures or low marks to the students mentioned. President Allen stated that the school was "in the red" and that there were students who felt that they could not attach much weight to Professor Jacobs' statements because he had no advanced degrees and had insufficient background; that he was receiving notice early because he was planning to build a home. Mr. Jacobs asked the President whether his decision was based upon these student opinions. The President said that it was not, and that he was taking action because he must have men with advanced degrees.

A few days later, Mr. Jacobs requested, through Dean Tribble, a year's leave of absence for graduate work. President Allen

asked for twenty-four hours to consider and at the end of that time declined to grant the request for a leave.

Jennis W. Futch was born in 1885. He was a graduate of Yale College (A.B. 1913) and the Yale Law School (LL.B. 1915). He accepted a professorship in the Stetson College of Law in 1925. At that time there was no explicit agreement as to the nature of his tenure although Professor Futch states that he understood it was a permanent position and communicated this understanding to President Hulley. He states, however, that in 1927, in response to an inquiry as to whether he was safe in building a home, he was told by President Hulley to go ahead and not to worry. He accordingly built a home. In 1932 he received a J.D. from Northwestern and is the only one of the three discharged professors to hold a doctor's degree. His salary having advanced to what appears to have been the maximum for a full professor, no further change in his status occurred until 1934. At that time, during an interregnum following the death of President Hulley, the Administrative Committee reduced Professor Futch's salary and made him librarian and part-time teacher. Professor Futch attributed dissatisfaction with his teaching which caused this change to handicaps under which he worked, including a very heavy teaching load. These handicaps were increased after 1934 by the distractions of nearly full-time library duties and by the fact that in 1934 he was required to give up his specialty, criminal law, to Mr. Raymond, when Mr. Raymond returned to Stetson from the University of Oregon Law School. In connection with the course in criminal law, it should be mentioned that Professor Futch had given much time and effort to a Florida crime survey.

When notified of his discharge on April 8, 1938, Professor Futch protested against the action and requested longer notice, but the President informed him that his plans were made and that they could not be changed.

Jacob A. Carpenter was born in 1882, and received the following degrees from Stetson University: B.S. 1911, M.S. 1917, LL.B. 1919. He was appointed professor in 1925, and states that he was told by Dr. Hulley that it would be a permanent position. Thereafter his salary was increased until it reached what appears to have been the maximum paid full professors. He attended summer

school at Columbia University in 1925 and 1926, and wished to pursue graduate studies further. He yielded, however, to requests from President Hulley to do extension work throughout Florida, and from 1927 to 1933 for seven summers he travelled the State on that mission. Once in the Allen administration, Mr. Carpenter told Dean Tribble that he would like to go away and take summer school work and the Dean asked him to teach in the Stetson summer school, indicating that he did not think that the President would require him to get any more degrees. Mr. Carpenter did, however, go to Northwestern for summer school work in 1935.

On April 12, 1938, President Allen called in Mr. Carpenter and told him that his contract would not be renewed because Stetson University must have men with higher degrees as the University was seeking further accrediting, and he added "you know how they look at us if we do not have teachers with those higher degrees." Mr. Carpenter also states that the President told him that the College of Law was "in the red" and he was going to make it pay its expenses or do away with it. Mr. Carpenter contented himself at that time with indicating his surprise and concern at being discharged so late in the year and at his age.

Principles of Tenure Applicable

The concept of academic tenure is an integral part of our academic system and forms one of the main inducements to the pursuit of an academic career. One of its presuppositions is that true learning and true culture are plants of slow growth. Unless definitely advised to the contrary, one entering upon an academic career should and does, according to this academic tradition, feel that after a probationary period of a few years he acquires a status of continuous or permanent tenure, which may be terminated only for adequate cause and in a manner that will assure the teacher in question a full measure of due process. This tradition embodies the conviction commonly held in higher educational circles that scholarship and a high grade of instruction which can only be nurtured by scholarship can best thrive in an atmosphere free from those fears and pressures used to promote produc-

tion in the business world. This tradition embodies a faith that love of learning and love of teaching thrive under these conditions to such an extent that pressures commonly used in the commercial world are unnecessary as well as harmful. The appreciation of this tradition is so widespread that it affords one of the elementary considerations that justify an academic life. Perhaps on the theory that this practice is known to all educators, the canons of academic freedom and tenure formulated by the Washington Conference in 1925¹ omit any explicit statement as to when continuous or permanent tenure begins. The canons state that the precise terms and expectations of every appointment should be stated in writing, but make no express provision for what should take place in case there is no writing. These details have been governed by academic custom and usage. Few things are better settled according to academic practice than that the expectations of an appointment are not presumptively embodied in the legal formulations of a contract signed by the parties. A probationary period of several years, followed by promotion, particularly to one of the three professorial ranks, is presumed to carry with it a permanent status even where the employment is continued from year to year under contracts legally binding for one year only.²

The manner in which an academic appointment may be terminated, however, is clearly covered in the statements agreed upon at the 1925 conference, representing the American Council on Education, the American Association of University Professors, the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Universities, the Association of Governing Boards, and other groups. The Stetson University catalogue states that it is a member of the American Council on Education, of the Association of American Colleges, and of the Association of American Law Schools. The third of these canons of academic tenure relates to the termination of a permanent appointment. It requires action by a faculty committee as well as by the governing board. It recognizes the right of the accused teacher to face his accusers

¹ February, 1939, *Bulletin*, pp. 29-31.

² See 1938 Statement of Principles agreed to by representatives of the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors (February, 1939, *Bulletin*, pp. 26-28).

and to be heard in his own defense by all bodies that pass on the case. Testimony of scholars in the same field should be taken on issues of professorial incompetence. Dismissals should not ordinarily take effect in less than a year from the time a decision is reached.

The canon relating to termination of temporary appointments states: "Notice of the decision to terminate should be given in ample time to allow the teacher an opportunity to secure a new position. The extreme limit for such notice should not be less than three months before the expiration of the academic year."

The better day law schools in this country belong to the Association of American Law Schools. It is well known in member schools that the best opportunities for employment occur at the annual meeting of the Association at the end of December and that any termination of services after that period will usually not allow time to secure a position for the following academic year.

Violations of Principles of Tenure

It seems clear from the foregoing that each of the three men was on continuous or permanent tenure. If Mr. Jacobs' nearly five years were insufficient to be conclusive, his repeated and continued advances in salary and his rapid promotion to an associate professorship would seem to supply more than the needed additional evidence of permanency.

Consequently, the complainants could properly be discharged only for cause. The alleged professional incompetence was not incompetence newly developed, nor did it develop after promotion to professorial status. The administration of the University could not fairly charge preëxisting incompetence at this late date. If the issue of competence were properly raised, the complainants were still improperly afforded no opportunity to face their accusers. They were given substantially no opportunity to be heard in their own defense. If the discharge of the majority of the College of Law faculty precluded the formation of a faculty committee competent to hear their case, a general University faculty committee could have been formed. If that were not possible, the elements

of a fair hearing should still have been afforded the complainants before the governing board of the University.¹

Upon the unjustified assumption that the complainants' tenure was from year to year only, the notice of decision to terminate was too close to the end of the year. In no case was time given to allow the teacher an opportunity to secure a new position. In one case only was the interval before the expiration of the academic year as long as three months.

Qualifying Circumstances

Does further inquiry into the circumstances of the discharges indicate that they were an unskillful attempt to achieve the proper ends of education, or does it reveal them as positive violations preceded by no accepted conditions of tenure?

The late notice of discharge was preceded by no warning to complainants that their tenure was insecure. Were it not for the fact that Professor Jacobs had already been advanced to the rank of associate professor before 1936, President Allen's testimony might be regarded as evidence that he had given Professor Jacobs adequate notice that he should obtain another degree. The committee, however, is unable to accept President Allen's version of his conversation with Mr. Jacobs. Mr. Jacobs was an exceptionally straightforward witness. He showed conscientious discrimination in his answers. He is confirmed by Mr. Tribble at all points within Mr. Tribble's knowledge. President Allen's statements in his correspondence have been disproved in many particulars and his testimony in the hearing was sometimes evasive and equivocal. If President Allen did tell Mr. Jacobs that he would be discharged unless he obtained higher degrees, it is extremely unlikely that he would have kept this a secret from the Dean of the College of Law. Furthermore, President Allen did not deny, but by implication admitted to the committee, that he requested Mr. Jacobs to teach during one of the two summers that followed the only conversation between them about graduate degrees prior to the notification of discharge. Advancing Mr. Jacobs' salary was not suggestive of

¹ In this connection, it should be pointed out that subsequently in May, 1939, the University's administration through Judge Reaves specifically disclaimed any and all charges of alleged incompetency on the part of the dismissed professors as a ground for justifying the dismissal. See pp. 398-399, *infra*.

permanent adherence to the decision not to promote him. Mr. Carpenter testified: "Nothing unpleasant happened before the time of our dismissals. I felt that Dr. Allen was a man of very good nature—very pleasant. He would come along and put his arm through mine and walk along with me. I was never warned by him to spend less time on my farm.¹ I was never warned about taking graduate work."

Whatever the interpretation placed upon the action taken with reference to Professor Futch in 1934, two advances in salary indicated that President Allen's attitude towards him was not unfavorable.

A further circumstance should be briefly mentioned, which in the opinion of the committee tends to aggravate the University's offense. It appears that at about the time Mr. Jacobs received his notice, early in March, 1938, and perhaps even prior thereto, there were rumors in De Land, and in the State generally, of the impending shake-up. These rumors pretty accurately predicted what later occurred, including the change in the deanship. The most natural explanation for these rumors seems to be some sort of administrative "leak," and in any event they increased the humiliation suffered by the complainants, who first learned of them after they had been discharged.

The Competency of Complainants

Pronounced incompetency on the part of all three professors creating an emergency would tend to mitigate the seriousness of the violation of accepted principles of tenure. The damage to the professional reputation of complainants produced by their discharge on such grounds affords further reason for a discussion of competency.

The most discriminating opinions concerning the discharged professors were given by Mr. Tribble and Dean Raymond. Although they differed in their conclusions, the opinions check with

¹ Mr. Carpenter had an orange grove which he frequently visited on week-ends and infrequently during the week. He spent there the two out of twelve preceding summers when he was not pursuing extension work or graduate studies. There is no evidence that he was ever unprepared for class. In the absence of any provision for retirement made by the University, he considered it wise to spend time that others spend on golf or tennis in the attempt to make some provision for his old age.

one another in many respects. Comparisons of these opinions with each other and with those of recent graduates of the school vindicate Mr. Carpenter's competence as a teacher. He was, to be sure, a high marker, somewhat easy-going in class, and frequently utilized anecdotes in his teaching. Such teachers are generally preferred by students of inferior application or of inferior ability. The striking thing about Mr. Carpenter's reputation, however, was that the best students most strongly approved him. The anecdotes in his teaching emphasized practical points which alumni remembered. After class, he was ready to discuss cases indefinitely and, particularly in Constitutional Law, disclosed a mastery of historical background.

Letters tendered by the complainants are subject to the usual reservations attaching to recommendations, but in these letters the regard expressed for Professor Carpenter was certainly more than perfunctory. Alumni interrogated considered him not only the best of the discharged professors, but perhaps the best teacher in the school. This evidence indicates that Professor Carpenter's discharge was not only an injustice to him, but also a real loss to the University.

Though not made the basis of a formal charge against Mr. Carpenter, it was apparent that Dean Raymond regarded his general approach to legal and political issues as out-moded and there was evidence that irritation had existed between them for some time.

As to Professor Futch, his many years of service, the assurances he had received from President Hulley, the absence of any evidence of decreased competency, all reinforce the presumption of permanency upon which he was entitled to rely. His treatment by the administration of the University does not satisfy his just expectations or the requirements of accepted principles of academic tenure.

In assigning reason for Professor Jacobs' dismissal President Allen and Dean Raymond used the formula that "he did not have the confidence of his students." There seem to be two explanations for this charge. For one thing he was a strict marker and, like most strict markers, his competency and his fairness were frequently questioned by students who received lower marks than those

to which they felt entitled. Mr. Jacobs was for a time vulnerable to such criticism since he was necessarily at some disadvantage when he first began to teach because he had been in business for approximately a decade.

Mr. Jacobs made a strong impression on the committee. His good command of English, the speed, clarity, and incisiveness of his answers to questions, the absence of apparent overstatements or offensive characterizations, and the skill with which he aided the cases of his co-complainants had a strong cumulative effect. His record as a student at Northwestern University reinforces this favorable general impression with evidence of academic aptitude of high order. There was some evidence to the effect that he slackened in his studies about 1936, but the President's suggestion that promotion was to be attained less by success in teaching than by the comparatively irrelevant route of obtaining an additional degree may well have had a temporarily distracting effect. An alumnus with an excellent record, however, who was in school at that time, stated that Mr. Jacobs had shown continuous and great improvement as a teacher in the course of three academic years. This confirms Dean Tribble's opinion concerning Mr. Jacobs' progress.

The gaps in information which caused criticism must have been largely cured by 1938, for he taught more different courses than any other professor on the faculty. He may well have given many students cause to suspect the completeness of his knowledge while he was familiarizing himself with such a diversity of subjects. He was discharged just as he was about to have an opportunity to bear the full fruits of his cultivation of a large portion of the curriculum.

In justice to the dismissed professors, it should again be emphasized that the University has withdrawn its reliance upon incompetency as a justification of the dismissals.¹

The "Annual Contract"

In addition to the University's defense that the discharged professors were incompetent, the administration of the University justifies its action on the additional ground that no such thing as

¹ See pp. 398-399.

"continuous" or "permanent tenure" exists at Stetson, since all members of the faculty are employed on a yearly basis. It is true that as far back as anyone consulted in De Land could remember, members of the faculty of all ranks have received from the President each spring a "contract" for the next year. The view of this Association, however, has been that while such contracts may be effective to determine the legal rights of the parties, they are not relevant to the expectancy which a teacher is justified in forming on the basis of accepted academic standards of tenure. All three men were, in the opinion of the committee, entitled to consider themselves on continuous or permanent tenure even though their employment may have been on a year-to-year basis from a purely legal standpoint.

Concerning Mr. Tribble

The committee was impressed by Mr. Tribble's bearing as a witness under trying circumstances and has given great weight to his testimony. He testified that he had no inkling that he was to be replaced as Dean until about the time Professors Futch and Carpenter were notified of their discharges. The committee interviewed Mr. Tribble in private, and discussed with him the use that might be made of his testimony. He stated that his only course was to tell the truth as he saw it, but he requested the committee to limit use of his testimony as far as possible. It has become apparent that no adequate report could be made omitting the important testimony of one in Mr. Tribble's position.

Mr. Tribble's testimony was singularly free from malice or ill-will against either Dean Raymond or President Allen. He accepted Dean Raymond's statement that he had not sought the deanship. No report of Mr. Tribble's contribution to Stetson University College of Law is of his seeking. The trend of the school under his administration seems relevant to the administration's contention that the reorganization was necessitated by an emergency.

When Mr. Tribble came to Stetson as a professor in 1922, the College of Law had a two-year course, and applied without rigor an entrance requirement of a high school education. From 1924 to 1938 he was the head of the School successively with the titles

of Chairman of the Law Faculty, Acting Dean, and Dean. During this period standards were raised so that, in 1930, the school was approved by the American Bar Association, and in 1931 it was admitted to the Association of American Law schools.

Compliance with the standards of these accrediting organizations meant that applicants for admission must have full high school work and two years of college work thoroughly authenticated and that the law school course must be increased to three years.

With the waxing of the Florida real estate boom around 1925-1926, the College of Law rapidly reached its peak of attendance of about eighty-five students. The collapse of the boom, together with the general depression, and the situation created by the rapid progress of the College of Law's educational requirements naturally resulted in a drastic shrinkage of attendance and, in 1932, the low of thirty-two students was reached. April issues of the Stetson University catalogue give the following figures for total attendance in the College of Law at the dates indicated:

1933.....	38	1936.....	55
1934.....	42	1937.....	55
1935.....	52	1938.....	61

Dean Raymond reported an attendance of sixty-four during the fall semester of 1938.¹

President Allen assigned as one of the reasons for the emergency confronting the College of Law which required drastic action with reference to its faculty that, while the University had increased by 125 per cent or more, the College of Law had not increased by more than one or two students. His statement conveys a different picture from that given by the foregoing figures. There is no evidence that the increase was due to a lowering of standards.

¹ On April 10, 1939, Dean Raymond wrote the General Secretary respecting the above enrolment figures as follows:

"These are taken from the annual University catalogs. I do not know how these figures were compiled. In some instances I know that extra summer school students have been included in reports. I have checked the actual first semester registration since 1933 and have obtained the following figures:

1933.....	41	1936.....	50
1934.....	55	1937.....	53
1935.....	53	1938.....	64

"I call this to your attention in order that you may reconsider the report's reflection on President Allen's statement."

The manner in which the faculty was being administered is also relevant to the claim that an emergency required drastic changes in the College of Law. Although the University was operating under a restricted budget, Mr. Paul E. Raymond, J.D. State University of Iowa, LL.M., S.J.D. Harvard Law School, was procured as an instructor in 1932. Dean Tribble thus strengthened the faculty without resort to any upheaval that might damage the reputation of the school or otherwise prevent the consolidation of the progress already achieved. If the school was to be criticized for partaking unduly of an easy-going character, this character was somewhat modified by bringing in Professor Raymond.

Various theories were advanced by alumni; some to the effect that the upset in the College of Law was in part due to discontent with Dean Tribble's administration on the part of President Allen, and others that it took place for reasons quite fortuitous from an educational point of view. A longer investigation would be required to make an adequate report on the ramified relations involved.

Causes of the Dismissals

Dean Raymond and certain alumni expressed the view that the Stetson College of Law was losing its position to the Law School of the University of Florida. Expansion at the State institution had caused many of the alumni and trustees of Stetson University to feel the need of a more aggressive policy on the part of the University. When President Allen appeared before the Executive Committee of the Association of American Law Schools in the spring of 1938, he disclosed that the changes in the Stetson College of Law had been influenced by the possibility of procuring a new donation of some \$50,000. He conveyed the impression that a refurbishing of his catalogue with an array of graduate degrees might have a favorable effect upon the prospective donor.

Some of President Allen's statements indicated that he was ill informed concerning the relationship between law degrees and law teaching. An A.B. at Wesleyan and an LL.B. at Yale are sufficient to qualify as far as degrees go for a professorship in any law school where the appointing authorities are well informed. President Allen wrote the General Secretary a letter indicating his

opinion that Professor Jacobs was unqualified for the Stetson College of Law largely because of his lack of higher degrees. When examined by the investigating committee he took the position that he had warned the law school teachers to procure more degrees, because when he first came to the University he spoke to the entire faculty about procuring Master's and Doctor's degrees as soon as possible, but almost in the next breath he gave an affirmative answer when asked whether an LL.B. following an A.B. was not generally considered substantially equivalent to a Ph.D.

The central ambition about which President Allen's action seemed to revolve, however, was increase of students. His conversation with the committee kept coming back to the increase in the student body of the college since his accession to the presidency.

Dean Raymond defended the action of the President before the committee, and argued that it was necessary for the advancement and even survival of the school. No examination of the real cause for discharging the complainants seems adequate which does not include some examination of the manner in which President Allen and Dean Raymond came to share the same views. Without question the President's chief adviser in the affair was Dean Raymond. He disclaimed, however, any responsibility for the abruptness of the discharges, or for the failure of the University to give the discharged men a hearing and adequate notice.

In his written statement Dean Raymond asserted that in the fall of 1937 he had received an offer and an inquiry from sources outside Stetson and he had become doubtful whether it was wise for him to remain, since he considered the College of Law handicapped by a mediocre faculty. He discussed the problem with friends, including Dean Tribble, who did not wholly concur with his pessimistic diagnosis of the situation, particularly with reference to the abilities of Professor Jacobs and the quality of the students the College of Law was attracting.

Professor Raymond was, however, apparently deterred from leaving Stetson by the fact that he anticipated some action by President Allen with regard to the College of Law. He states

that he was led to this conclusion by the fact that at the beginning of the school year in 1937 the President met him in the corridor of the Administration Building and told him that he would like to talk over some matters concerning the College of Law with him, and by the further fact that the President had already reorganized other departments, which led him to expect an effort to correct what he regarded as a serious condition in the College of Law.

Some time in February, 1938, he stated, he was called into the President's office and asked what was wrong with the College of Law. His answer was that, with the exception of Dean Tribble, the difficulty lay in the quality of its personnel. He informed the President that he regarded Professors Futch and Jacobs as incompetent, and considered Professor Carpenter's teaching efficiency as questionable. According to his testimony, the President then expressed an intention to make certain changes in the College of Law, and he replied that he was glad to learn this because he was not interested in remaining at the College unless some changes were made. He informed the President that he had had inquiries from another university, and suggested that if the President contemplated changes in the College of Law it might perhaps be best to let the whole faculty go, and that he would himself take a position elsewhere. He asserts that President Allen persuaded him to stay.

The question of the deanship is, of course, not directly relevant to this investigation. Since, however, the advice of Mr. Raymond played a part in the discharge of the three complainants in this case, and since the displacement of Dean Tribble was intimately connected with their discharge, it seems appropriate to quote briefly from Mr. Raymond's statements concerning the deanship. He writes that in the conference with Dr. Allen already discussed, the President "stated that he had suggested to Dean Tribble the possibility of my being dean in case Dean Tribble accepted the judgeship [to which there was a chance he would be appointed by the Governor]. At that time I told President Allen that I would not accept the deanship under any circumstances unless it was acceptable to Dean Tribble, that we were the best of friends, and that I would not sacrifice Dean Tribble's friendship for the deanship. Later Dean Tribble came into my office and said that Dr.

Allen had informed him that he wished to make a change in the deanship in the College of Law along with other changes and that he proposed to offer me the deanship. I told Dean Tribble that I would not accept it unless it were agreeable to him. Dean Tribble said that he fully appreciated that and he knew that if he requested it I would not accept the position. He said that he would do everything he could to cooperate with me. . . . We talked the matter over and he agreed that he would be in a better position if I accepted the deanship than if someone were brought in from some other school to be dean. Shortly after this, President Allen called me into his office and offered me the deanship, which I accepted."

As to the discharge of the three men who are complainants in this case, there is no reason to doubt that Mr. Raymond's advice was a factor influencing the President, and in the case of Professor Carpenter, in the opinion of the committee, may very well have been the determining factor.

While virtually all the evidence goes to reinforce the conclusion that Dean Raymond was the sole informed source from which President Allen could procure an opinion adverse to the competency of all three professors, the most probable inference is that President Allen was in the first instance solely responsible for the unnecessary delay in notifying or warning the men which makes these cases particularly flagrant. President Allen stated to the Executive Committee of the Law School Association that he did not notify the men earlier because he feared that they would cause trouble and demoralize the college.

Responsibility of the Trustees

The Board of Trustees seems to have acted in a passive rôle. Two members of the Administrative Committee, Mr. Hon and Mr. Mickle, expressed the opinion that all the discharged professors were inefficient, although Mr. Mickle suggested that Mr. Carpenter was the best of the three. Both members of the Committee dated their opinions from 1934, the only time when they came into direct contact with the problems of the school. In the meantime they had approved salary raises for all three and the

promotion of Mr. Jacobs. None of the trustees questioned could remember any conversation with President Allen about the men until the meeting at which the President announced the discharges as an accomplished fact. The most definite assumption of responsibility by the trustees occurred when their representative, in conference with the Executive Committee of the Association of American Law Schools, disclaimed reliance upon the charges of incompetency.

The Insurance Incident. The conduct of one member of the Administrative Committee of the Board of Trustees should be noted with reference to general conditions of tenure at Stetson. About Christmas, 1937, Mr. Jacobs was on his way to lunch in the town when he was stopped on the sidewalk by Mr. E. L. Hon, the Vice-President of the Board of Trustees, who seems to have acted as chairman of that body during the frequent absence of the President, Mr. John B. Stetson, Jr., who resides in Philadelphia. Mr. Hon solicited the fire insurance on a house which Mr. Jacobs planned building. Mr. Jacobs' testimony described this conversation in some detail. He demurred upon the ground that he was on exceptionally intimate terms with another insurance agent to whom he had intended to give the business. His testimony is that Mr. Hon then said, "Mr. X is a very fine man and represents a good company, but Mr. X did not hire you. He is not responsible for your keeping your job. I hired you and I am responsible for your keeping your job." Mr. Jacobs made a non-committal reply and proceeded to lunch, where he met several people to whom he expressed his indignation. Mr. Hon went to the postoffice where he saw Mr. Raymond. Mr. Raymond testified: "Mr. Hon told me that he had mentioned to Mr. Jacobs the matter of writing for him the insurance on his house. He told me . . . he had said to Mr. Jacobs . . . 'After all, you want to remember that you work for us and we all want to work together' or something to that effect. . . . He felt that he had said something that he should not have said or . . . he was afraid . . . Mr. Jacobs had taken what he had said in a different way than he had intended it. . . ." When Mr. Hon was questioned by the committee, he admitted soliciting Mr. Jacobs' insurance at the time and place in question, but denied any reference to Mr. Jacobs' employment

and denied recollection of having discussed the conversation with anyone thereafter. Mr. Raymond, being present at Mr. Hon's examination, reasserted his testimony.

Newspaper Publicity

During the hearing at the University, Dean Raymond expressed solicitude that press publicity be avoided. The extent to which De Land, Daytona Beach, and other Florida papers knew or might know of the fact that an investigation was going on was discussed in various aspects. The day after the committee left De Land the *De Land Sun News* carried a two-column entry down nearly the full length of the front page with an eight-column two-line "scare-head" to the effect that Stetson's rating would not be affected by the committee's findings. This item was written up as an interview with Dean Raymond. Besides containing references to the American Association of University Professors as a union composed of comparatively few college professors whose "blacklisting" meant little, it included the misstatement that the rules of the Association require only three months' notice and that two of the discharged professors had five months' and the third six months' notice. The most unequivocally false statement of fact, however, was the statement that the Association of American Law Schools had washed its hands of the matter. This last statement was particularly inappropriate if it came from Dean Raymond because the relationship of the Association of American Law Schools to the investigation had been discussed at length at the hearing and had been made the subject of a detailed statement by Professor McLaughlin on behalf of Professor Hepburn and himself in Dean Raymond's presence and in the presence of several witnesses. When a copy of this newspaper came into the hands of Professor McLaughlin about a week after its date, he wrote Dean Raymond calling attention to the facts and announcing that, whether or not Dean Raymond was correctly quoted, his conduct in the premises would be considered by the committee as further evidence of his credibility as a witness and of his competence to be a dean. Dean Raymond immediately wrote the then president of the Association of American Law Schools, describing the entire

situation and enclosing copies of Mr. McLaughlin's letter and the newspaper articles. In response to an inquiry from Professor Fuller, Dean Raymond made statements on this matter first to Professor Fuller and then to Professor McLaughlin to the effect that he did not know he was being interviewed; that the paper put a misleading interpretation upon what he said about the American Association of University Professors and that he did not make the misstatement attributed to him about the Association of American Law Schools. No correction of these matters was published, however. Dean Raymond explained that the difference between the facts and the statements attributed to him was so slight as to be beyond the grasp of the average reader and that he believed a repudiation by him would be misinterpreted.

Action of Association of American Law Schools

The Executive Committee of the Association of American Law Schools made public at the annual meeting of the Association in December, 1938, a brief statement to the effect that the Committee on Tenure had reported serious violations of principles of tenure at Stetson University and that the matter remained before the Association for such action as might finally be found appropriate.

The Executive Committee, being about to retire in favor of a newly elected committee, further voted to request the incoming President to call a special meeting of the new committee whenever necessary or appropriate to take action in the Stetson case and ordered that in default of such a special meeting the matter be made a special order of business for the annual May meeting of the Committee.

In May, 1939, Judge O. K. Reaves, a member of the Board of Trustees, appeared before the Executive Committee of the Association of American Law Schools in behalf of John B. Stetson University. In this conference, Judge Reaves disclaimed any and all charges of alleged incompetency on the part of Professors Carpenter, Futch, and Jacobs, taking the position that their dismissal, or the failure to continue their employment, was based upon and to be justified solely because the University operated on an annual contract system. During the conference, the

Executive Committee explained to Judge Reaves the custom and usage of academic tenure and proposed certain action for partial rectification of the injustice caused by the dismissals. Judge Reaves subsequently laid these terms before the Trustees. No rectification of the situation resulted. In consequence, the President of the Association, acting on the terms of a resolution of the Executive Committee, on July 15, 1939, declared operative the suspension from the Association of American Law Schools of the College of Law of John B. Stetson University.

Conclusion

On the basis of the findings set forth in this report, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the American Association of University Professors concludes that the dismissals of Professors Jacobs, Futch, and Carpenter from the faculty of the College of Law of John B. Stetson University were in violation of well-established and generally recognized principles and standards of academic tenure.

W. T. LAPRADE, *Chairman*
Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure

Approved for publication by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, W. T. Laprade, *Chairman*.

CONCERNING ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE

By W. C. ALLEE

University of Chicago

The statement of principles¹ formulated by joint conferences of representatives of the American Association of University Professors and the Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure of the Association of American Colleges deserves close study. There is evidence that college presidents are interested in the report, and it is to be hoped that university administrators and college and university faculty members will consider it carefully. Certain aspects of the problems involved are stated by President H. M. Wriston of Brown University² in favorably presenting the report to the Association of American Colleges, and other aspects by President W. C. Dennis of Earlham College³ in dissenting.

For convenience in making this communication I shall assume certain simplifying definitions. The document under discussion will be called the Statement; and all institutions of higher learning will be referred to as colleges, even though many of the problems concern universities as much or more than they do the independent colleges. Faculty men, whether engaged primarily in teaching or in research or in some combination of these with petty administration, will be called teachers.

My long continuing concern with the problems involved and my unique position as a personal friend and associate of both Professor A. J. Carlson of the American Association of University Professors and President W. C. Dennis of the Association of American Colleges, whose views are divergent, combined with my fourteen years of service on the Board of Trustees of Earlham

¹ February, 1939, *Bulletin of American Association of University Professors*, pp. 26-28; March, 1939, *Bulletin of Association of American Colleges*, pp. 179-181.

² March, 1939, *Bulletin of Association of American Colleges*, pp. 110-123; June, 1939, *Bulletin of American Association of University Professors*, pp. 328-343.

³ March, 1939, *Bulletin of Association of American Colleges*, pp. 181-191.

College, provide the stimulus and background for my thinking and writing on this subject.

Apparently the Statement undertakes to present in generalized form the positive basic considerations that underlie the general problems of academic freedom and tenure, and to do this without recommending the setting up of sanctions. It represents an attempt to find common ground and suggest certain attitudes that can be taken by trustees, administrators, teachers, and, I hope, students, on this vital common problem. The Statement, it will be noticed by the careful reader, outlines what should be done in a variety of situations involving academic freedom and tenure, rather than what shall be done to avoid certain penalties.

The conferees seem correctly to have believed that the very great majority of responsible trustees, administrators, and faculty members are men of good will who are genuinely devoted to advancing the education of college students and supplying appropriate professorial leadership where required by the general public. The crucial statement about academic freedom is found in the last paragraph on that subject in which it is recognized that: "The college or university teacher is a citizen, a member of a learned profession, and an officer of an educational institution. When he speaks or writes as a citizen, he should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but his special position in the community imposes special obligations. As a man of learning and an educational officer, he should remember that the public may judge his profession and his institution by his utterances. Hence he should at all times be accurate, should express appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that he is not an institutional spokesman."

Everyone seems to believe that so far this is an excellent statement. It has been objected, however, that the next sentence, concluding the paragraph, is hopelessly weak. It reads: "The judgment of what constitutes fulfillment of these obligations should rest with the individual."

Those who are acquainted with college teachers know that this is what actually happens every day in the year. Not all the individual decisions so made are wise, but the rarity of adverse

public criticism of the utterances of teachers indicates that their self-discipline is of an extraordinarily high order, although they express opinions of an explosive nature in classrooms, private conversations, and public statements day in and day out. In the long run, the public words and actions of teachers seem to be as wise and sane as those of deans, presidents, or trustees.

Dr. Wriston argues wisely that adherence of institutions to the principle of the full responsibility of the individual teacher would relieve the college administration of responsibility for professional expressions of opinion on public matters. Under existing conditions the attempt of administrators to deny this responsibility is unconvincing. Unless colleges generally will say and mean that their teachers speak on their own responsibility when they speak as citizens, the public will not cease to hold the college responsible.

The actual condition under which the teacher acts, and which is never absent from his mind, is stated by President Wriston: "It is extremely important to remember that, while a teacher appears to have greater freedom because he moves behind the ramparts of his institution, he is also more vulnerable because a board of trustees can deprive him of his position." It is this condition, I hope, that the present Statement seeks to guard against; that is, it implies that this power, which trustees undoubtedly possess, is not fairly used when an otherwise competent teacher is dismissed from his position because of his attitude on some public question. But Dr. Dennis is more openly, and essentially more kindly realistic, in his suggestion that for doubtful cases there should exist some kind of an investigating body to determine whether the teacher has in fact transgressed proper bounds. Such a body, if well selected, may be of more solid worth to the teacher than the hope that the trustees would always be judicial and fair-minded.

The Statement drawn up in 1925, which the present one seeks to clarify, adhered to this general idea, suggesting that doubtful cases should be referred to a committee of the faculty. President Dennis is not dogmatic in his ideas on the composition of such a body, but his suggestion is that it be composed of representatives of the faculty and of the trustees. The usefulness of such a committee deserves discussion.

A faculty committee, as proposed in 1925, is a simple device; but neither the officers of the American Association of University Professors nor of the Association of American Colleges have any record of any such committee having been called for in the fourteen years that the existing Statement has been in partial operation. It would be interesting to inquire into the reasons for this complete failure of a test of the proposed machinery. Perhaps there has been administrative doubt of its wisdom and faculty doubt of its effectiveness, or *vice versa*. Certainly there has been no unusual dearth of cases which might have been investigated. Would the addition of committee members selected from the trustees (who have, as President Wriston reminds us, power to discipline the teachers) make for a more effective instrument?

To be completely adequate, such a committee should represent the public in general, education in general, the particular college in its legal, administrative and teaching aspects, the constituency of the institution, including the alumni, and the student body. Merely naming the factors that deserve representation on such a refereeing body indicates the complexity of the problem, once we depart from the simple and courageous solution, that of individual responsibility, recommended in the present Statement.

Perhaps a partial substitute for such an elaborate body, if we must have one at all, could be secured by laying the cases as they arise before a committee made up of representatives from the Association of American Universities (even in cases concerning colleges), the Association of American Colleges (even in cases concerning universities), and the American Association of University Professors. This committee should be cognizant not only of special local problems but of the larger aspects of this thing called academic freedom.

The severe disciplining of a faculty member, charged with violating his institutional responsibility in the pursuit of discharging what he believes to be his duty as a citizen, is not merely a local concern; nor can even the best intentioned of locally minded faculty or trustees deal with the problem wisely. And with the sense of personal responsibility that comes from fair and generous treatment, there will be fewer instances of lack of cooperation on

the part of teachers. It is my belief that the exceptions had best be calmly neglected by all concerned.

If I have written at some length on this point it is in part because of its general importance and in part because of my personal experience. In the hectic days of American participation in the World War, I attempted to maintain as consistent a pacifist attitude as could be done under the circumstances. Persons who have had no experience in standing out of line can have little conception of the enormous pressure of public opinion on such an individual. In my own case the attempt made to have me dismissed from my professorship in a small college was balked by the presence on the board of trustees of men of large affairs and consequent perspective. I am therefore not unaware of the safeguards that trustees may place about teachers under public pressure. Also I realize that a teacher who dares to face adverse public opinion must not only be honestly convinced of his own divergent position, but must in general be a desirable member of the college community or he will be dismissed for incompetence in his profession.

For all these reasons I reiterate my endorsement of the simple statement that when all things are considered the final judgment of what constitutes fulfillment of his peculiar and exacting responsibilities in his activities as a citizen should rest with the individual teacher.

There is another aspect of this problem which is usually neglected. This concerns our grave need for the balanced, sane statements many of our academic men could make on public questions, and for the thought-provoking criticisms of current fallacies which they could and, I think, should provide. There is even a place for the public presentation of radical and reactionary points of view on their part. If these latter are to be argued at all, as they will be in any case, let them be competently set forth. To my mind, the problem of how to secure an increasing participation of teachers in affairs of moment is much more vital than the problem of dealing with those few who participate unwisely. For this end, the setting up of prospective instruments of inquiry does not encourage teachers, already selected for scholarly caution, to supply the active leadership of which they are capable,

and which is needed in our present American scene. Therefore, if objectors to the present Statement call for a tribunal to investigate the activities of my colleagues who appear to overstep proper bounds, I want another to investigate the silences of those others who ought to speak and do not. Quite seriously, I submit that the docket of the latter would be the more crowded.

A second point in the Statement to which exception has been taken concerns the exact number of years which should be spent in probation before a teacher is given a continuing appointment. I have no particular quarrel with the dissenting suggestion that, if needed, a college might have four years in which to decide whether a given teacher would fit into its faculty, regardless of how many probationary years he has spent elsewhere.¹ The number of years, if not too long, is a detail; the principle, that after proving his worth a teacher should be given a continuing contract regardless of rank, is highly important. As a member of a trustees' committee on officers, I have struggled with inherited problems, in which a man has been given another year's chance and then another year's chance, and so on, before a final decision has been reached. Some of our best institutions are still guilty of this practice, which should be cured.

Finally, there is the vexed question of termination of appointment for cause. The Statement sets up certain standard safeguards: a hearing, if possible both before a faculty committee and the governing board, charges in writing, a chance for the teacher to be heard in his own defense, to have the aid of a counsel of his own choosing, a stenographic report of the proceeding, and, if charged with incompetence, the testimony of qualified witnesses.

For many and obvious reasons, questions of dismissal for cause tend to be sidestepped, if possible, by administrators. Gossip

¹ The pertinent provision of the 1938 Statement is as follows: "Beginning with appointment to the rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank, the probationary period should not exceed six years, including within this period full-time service in all institutions of higher education; but subject to the proviso that when, after a term of probationary service of more than three years in one or more institutions, a teacher is called to another institution it may be agreed in writing that his new appointment is for a probationary period of not more than three years, even though thereby the person's total probationary period in the academic profession is extended beyond the normal maximum of six years. Notice should be given at least one year prior to the expiration of the probationary period, if the teacher is not to be continued in service after the expiration of that period."—*The Editor*

aside, faculty colleagues are notoriously tender-hearted with their less competent fellows. This is one stumbling block between us and a more truly democratic organization of academic life. In the long run, it is necessary to regard the welfare of the students involved and of research projects, and to disregard such unrest and uncertainty as may exist among teachers, even when incompetents are weeded out of their ranks. I am happy to testify that on this point I have usually found my fellow trustees as sensitive to the human values involved as one could wish.

Regarding dismissals, President Dennis makes a decided dissenting point to the effect that if the investigations preceding a possible dismissal by the college are to be so safeguarded, investigations by Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the American Association of University Professors should be conducted under similar regulation. Such a contention overlooks one basic consideration. The investigation regarding a teacher's incompetence, held before the appropriate governing body, may and often does lead to dismissal. The governing body has the responsibility and it has the power to act. Committee A, on the other hand, has power to investigate and to report only. It has no power to act beyond its presentation of its findings and recommendations, and I know of no one who is proposing that it should have such power. I am not undervaluing the very considerable pressure that an investigation by the American Association of University Professors or even the fear of such an investigation can exert on college administrators and governing bodies; but, to my lay mind, there is still a significant difference, which may and, in fact, should call for different procedures in the two cases.

Incidentally, President Dennis' concern about the investigations of Committee A bears testimony to the value of the work of this committee and if his proposal at this point were adopted these investigations would acquire an official status far greater than they have had to date. This is an unexpected turn; from this point of view there is something to be gained by the American Association of University Professors in accepting his suggestion.

My conclusion is that while the proposed Statement is by no means a perfect instrument it is an advance over the document

which it replaces. It should be approved as standard practice not only by the organizations whose representatives produced it, but also by individual boards of trustees and faculties.

And, lest my professional colleagues gain a wrong impression, I wish to add my observation that President Dennis is, in practice, more liberal than has been inferred by some of them from his present dissent. I am willing that they compare Earlham's treatment of its teachers during the ten years of Dr. Dennis' presidency with that during a similar period of the faculties of Brown, Harvard, Yale, or Chicago, though it may be objected with some truth that the standards implied by such a comparison are not overly high.

Contributors

W. C. ALLEE is Professor of Zoology at the University of Chicago. From 1925 to 1932 he served on the Association's Committee on Admissions. He was an alumni trustee of Earlham College from 1925 to 1939, and he has been a trustee of the Marine Biological Laboratory at Woods Hole, Massachusetts, since 1932.

F. R. AUMANN, Professor of Political Science at Ohio State University, was president of the chapter during the last academic year. The previous year he was secretary of the chapter.

HUGH HARTSHORNE is Professor (Research Associate in Religion) at Yale University.

ERNEST V. HOLLIS is Instructor of Education at The City College (New York).

WILLIAM H. KILPATRICK is Professor Emeritus of Education at Columbia University.

S. G. MORLEY is Professor of Spanish at the University of California.

E. H. STURTEVANT is Professor of Classical Philology at Yale University.

EARL L. VANCE, member of the Council, is Associate Professor of Journalism at Florida State College for Women. He was president of the chapter in 1936-1937.

FREEDOM AND TENURE: THE PROFESSION'S OWN PART¹

By EARL L. VANCE

Florida State College for Women

In securing acceptance of our principles of academic freedom and tenure, only part of our battle is with forces outside the profession. And this part of the battle, I believe, is relatively easy to win. On the basic decency of our principles most persons will agree if these principles are fairly presented to them. Our task with these persons without the ranks is purely an educational one. Most of them—and many of them get places on boards of trustees—have simply never thought of such a thing as tenure for professors. They just take it for granted that schools and colleges are run by those in charge of them much as a business is run by its owner, including hiring and firing at their pleasure. These persons are not antagonistic to the principles of tenure. They merely have never reflected on the nature of the profession of teaching which makes freedom and tenure a professional imperative. Once they are shown that without freedom there can not be honesty and without honesty all teaching must be suspect most of them as fair-minded individuals will, I am convinced, see that a very large measure of freedom and security is not only a right properly belonging to a responsible professional group, but that the best interest of society demands such a measure of freedom. On the fundamentally right judgment of the great majority of laymen, once the nature of the issues is made clear to them, I for one would confidently rely.

II

What we must do is get the facts before these people in an appropriate way. We can show them that all we ask has long

¹Address at joint meeting of Florida chapters, on April 30 (see pp. 443-444).

been a matter of practice in the best institutions, and that without it we can not properly discharge our function. Since most persons do not concern themselves with these problems one way or the other, the chief practical course called for is to get our position before boards who represent the laity and who do have to concern themselves with the problems. For the most part these are fair-minded and well-intentioned men, and I believe if we will make reasonable approaches to them, and inform them of what we want and the reasons we think we should have it, we will settle a good many Committee A cases before they ever arise. In this connection, I particularly think we ought to see that the *Bulletin* reaches every board member. This will show them better than anything else what we are doing and thinking. This of course is an individual chapter responsibility, but the national association has encouraged it by making a special price of fifty cents for subscriptions for this purpose. If chapters everywhere will avail themselves of this opportunity, I think it will do more than anything else to ward off hasty or indiscriminate actions out of keeping with our policies.

III

More problematic is the question of how to win the support of those within the profession itself who for a variety of reasons make it difficult to establish a professional esprit de corps that is after all the greatest safeguard against impositions from without. Many of these say, and they believe, that they agree with our principles of academic freedom and tenure. But they hasten to add that of course these principles should apply only in cases of "right thinking" professors—that is, of those who agree in all essential matters with themselves. To such, freedom and tenure as abstractions are well enough; as realities, they must be encompassed with large provisos. I need not enumerate all the forms these provisos can take. They vary from generation to generation, from nation to nation, from state to state, from locality to locality, from college to college, from person to person.

I do not criticize those who realize and say that the teaching of all of us must always and in all places be cognizant of the mores there obtaining. This is simple fact. Beyond doubt, teaching

must be conditioned at many points by student, community, time, and place. Skillful and yet incisive teaching must always skirt a more or less narrow path between truth on the one hand, and man's various dreams, inhibitions, ideologies, and customs, on the other. But to state this as a necessary fact, to accept it as a practical must, is nevertheless to recognize that there is always the chance that even the surest guide may misjudge his footing. Anyone who does not see this—who does not see that genuine teaching is constantly beset with pitfalls and the harder the pioneer the more likely he is to stumble into one of these pitfalls—does not understand at all the meaning of our program. He may use the phraseology we use and yet actually aid and abet the forces always at work seeking to standardize and regiment opinion and teaching by eliminating dissenters. He does this quite sincerely, often almost unconsciously, but I think unfortunately for the best interests of the profession.

There is another group of persons, rather large, I am afraid, who for a variety of reasons are almost a total loss so far as advancing our professional interests is concerned. Some of these prefer the tried and true tactics of what the Chinese call an elastic defense—that is, giving way easily at all points where pressure is applied. They are the "dears" of every campus. They are not much interested in the American Association of University Professors because they do not need to be. They are content to take what their benefactors in the goodness of their hearts give them. Only great adversity, so far as I have been able to observe, will cause them to take any interest in general professional problems, and then their interest is usually short-lived. For this brief period, though, they sometimes become among the noisiest of rebels, almost pathetic in their naïve bitterness as though now for the first time there were cause for concern.

There are many others of our colleagues who often seem depressingly obtuse where matters of professional welfare are concerned. There are those in considerable number who stand back because of the \$4.00 membership dues in the American Association of University Professors. They cheerfully pay this much every month to the Kiwanis Club. But their professional organization—that ought to be practically free: of what value is that? There

are others who don't like talk. They never believe in carrying an umbrella unless the rain is actually falling and pretty hard. There are others who feel very keenly the dignity of their profession. They are willing to await their call, and with equal piety they await whatever destiny, time and circumstance may bring them. To them events occur; they are never made. In any case, they will not stoop to interest themselves in such a thing as professional welfare. The good will always survive; only the diabolical are in danger of their lives, and they deserve to perish. History tells them that the contrary of all this has usually heretofore been true, that it has been the leaders and seers who have usually stood in danger of their life and liberty; but all that was reversed when they were born—or at least it is reversed in their institution.

Now what can be done with these, our brothers? We all love them. They are crushingly exasperating at times, but there they are, bless them! We would do them no harm. Perhaps the best thing after all is just to keep them on committees. Still we feel that, far from assuming their just share in furthering and elevating the standards of our mutual profession, they actually menace this cause. Perhaps, indeed, the existence of the American Association of University Professors, and particularly of Committee A, is warranted as much by these within as by others without the profession. Let's keep on talking to them, and let's listen with what tolerance we can to their rejoinders—that the American Association of University Professors doesn't really do anybody any good, that it is too radical, that it is too timid and conservative, that it costs too much, that it protects the lazy and incompetent (who usually don't join—they seek and usually get ample protection in other ways), that the chapter meetings are too long, that they do not deal with vital issues, that they border on treason, that the *Bulletin* prints more than they want to read—in fine, please excuse them. Let's do that. Let's not pass the word "scab." We believe that in building fine professional traditions we are benefiting them as well as ourselves, but let's continue to pay the whole bill with Christian fortitude. Let's be our brother's keeper.

IV

In emphasizing these obstacles, I have not meant to paint a discouraging picture. The outlook for our organization and its principles is brighter today than it ever was. We have made very appreciable gains all along the front. We have the largest membership in history, which means that not only have we a more solid front behind our principles, but that our financial limitations are somewhat eased so that greater backing can be given to the whole of the Association's work.

Not only this, but the acceptance of our principles and the prestige of our organization have made such wide gains that we now have the very potent force of respectability behind our cause. Institutions generally are acutely aware of the existence of the American Association of University Professors and of the principles for which it stands. The reasonableness of these principles has caused them to be widely endorsed by other leading educational organizations.

All this—and it is substantial—we have behind us. But I feel that we as a profession are still falling something short of wisdom in some very obvious particulars. The most obvious of all, it seems to me, is in realizing the supreme necessity, and particularly today, of building and maintaining a strong professional unity behind the minimum essentials of our organization and of our professional interests. We want the freedom indispensable to our function. We want the security indispensable to our freedom. I do not like to say it, for it smacks of totalitarianism, but whatever it smacks of, the barest truth is that freedom and security both come and can be maintained only by a considerable amount of solidarity and with a considerable amount of vigilance. We do not need to, nor would I want to see us, think alike in a great many particulars; but I do think we would be both wise and justified in building up more professional consciousness, more of the feeling of individual responsibility to our profession, than we have. We are far too prone to ask what do I as an individual get for the dime that we far too reluctantly give. There is a professional good that must be protected, and individuals must contribute the sum total to this professional good. The return to the individual is general

and universal, hence not obvious. We prosper as our profession prospers.

I said a while ago that the American Association of University Professors has the largest membership in history—almost 15,000. This is true, and still it is only about a fourth of the total number of college teachers eligible. I do not know what we can do to get the other three-fourths to realize that we are carrying a professional responsibility that is as much theirs as ours, but whatever we can do, we ought.

As I see the opportunities facing us now in furthering our security, they are along these lines: 1. Unify our own ranks behind a minimum program. This means enlarging our membership and educating the present membership as to the meaning of our program and particularly as to the importance of building up a group consciousness as a bulwark against arbitrary action. 2. A fuller use of our present resources in educating boards and the public generally as to the imperatives of our profession. We have heretofore made good use of our most powerful sanction—that of investigation and publication after a crisis comes. I think, however, we could do much more than we have to ward off these crises by a little timely and systematic education while the skies are still clear.

SELECTION AND RETENTION OF FACULTY MEMBERS¹

By E. H. STURTEVANT

Yale University

If you want abundant, emphatic, and unreliable advice about bringing up children, apply to those who have no children of their own. Well, I have had almost no experience in the selection and retention of members of a faculty. I have, to be sure, been employed for longer or shorter periods by seven colleges or universities, and I have been dismissed by one. I have for many years watched others select, retain, and dismiss faculty members, and I have observed the results with keen interest. I am also a diligent reader of the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors. I am not, however, familiar with any of the other literature on this subject. What I shall give you, then, is a hodge-podge of unverified opinion highly colored with emotion. I do not even know how much of it, if any, is original with me. If you agree with me that such stuff is of doubtful value, please remember that your committee asked for it.

II

Before we can decide how to choose instructors we must be clear in our minds about the fundamental purposes of our colleges and universities. In my opinion these are three: (1) to give abundant practice in thinking straight, (2) to present a few adequate samples of human knowledge, (3) to implant in some of our students the divine spark of scholarship.

I purposely omit a number of items that many would add to the list. No doubt college students should continue the training in the mores of the community, which they began as soon as they were born; but this training comes from mere living in the com-

¹ Address at regional meeting of Association in New York City, March 20 (see pp. 446-447).

munity, and is no function of the college as such. The attempt to inculcate doctrines held by a part of the community—a particular religion, the prejudices of any social class or economic group—is utterly out of place. If a church or an economic sect wants to maintain a school to propagate its peculiar views, that is its right; but I believe that the results are necessarily unfortunate.

Neither do I say anything about training for self-support. I am not blind to the advantages of regular meals; but for the community, at least, other things are more important, and it is with these that colleges and universities ought to be concerned. Of course there must be facilities somewhere for training men and women for the trades, including salesmanship, stenography, and banking; but the attempt to include such subjects in liberal arts colleges is disastrous for everybody.

Finally I say nothing about training any kind of creative artists. I yield to no one in my admiration for poets, painters, playwrights, and actors; but the artistic point of view is utterly different from that which, in my opinion, should prevail in colleges of liberal arts and in graduate schools. In the latter the attention should be concentrated upon understanding and knowing, not upon doing.

III

In the first place, then, our students must be trained to think. They must constantly be confronted by all sorts of problems, small and great. They must be encouraged to solve these, and then their solutions must be criticized in such a way that the youngsters will be likely to do a better job next time. That can be done only by an instructor who is ever alert and ever ready either to change his own conclusions or to provide new reasons for them. An instructor who knows all the answers and refuses to go behind them is worse than one who occasionally accepts an unsound argument. For example, the first sentence of Caesar's Gallic War contains *est divisa* in the sense "is divided," but many a bright boy has pulled a grammar on his teacher and maintained that *est divisa* means "has been divided." Now the good teacher can thereupon give an effective lecture upon certain features of

the Latin language and thereby show the boy the error in his argument. But the teacher who can not argue the boy down had better admit the translation "has been divided." The worst possible procedure is merely to say: "Usually, *est divisa* means 'has been divided' but here it means 'is divided.'"

In the second place, college students must be given a few adequate samples of human knowledge. It is not the function of the college to give a complete education—that would require several lifetimes. Neither should it attempt an outline of a complete education. An outline precludes discussion and gives a false impression of finality. The college student can not be taught the whole of zoology, but he can be taken far enough into some corner of zoology to understand what it is all about and how the science attacks an unsolved problem. For this he needs a teacher who is a real scholar, not a man who can summarize zoology as a complete and well-rounded body of knowledge—which neither zoology nor any other science can ever be.

But the chief function of the college and university is to pass on the torch of learning. A few years ago a certain well-known university undertook a campaign for additional endowment, and they had the courage to go to the business men of the city and say: "Give your money to encourage idle curiosity." In general the modern fashion of inventing "slogans" irritates me, but if ever there was a good "slogan" that was it.

The crowning glory of man is that he has some slight understanding of his environment, including man himself, and that, since the beginning of history, he has multiplied this understanding many times over. Nevertheless each new acquisition of knowledge reveals an enormous range of hitherto unsuspected ignorance. In general each generation learns more than the last, but each generation propounds many more problems than it solves. And, since the progress of the race in every field depends upon this same understanding of the world and of man, the propagation of scholarship is the outstanding need of mankind; and it is a problem that can be efficiently handled only by the colleges and universities.

So then the primary, all-important business of our faculties is to increase human knowledge and to attract the young to this

noble quest—to foster idle curiosity. Only slightly less important than this is to give the students an adequate acquaintance with several little corners of human knowledge, and to give them practice in thinking straight.

IV

From these considerations it would seem to follow that the chief task of those who recruit our faculties is to find scholars. If the scholars are men and women of attractive personality and if they can present their ideas effectively to the young, that is fine. But what is the use of a good teacher if he has nothing to teach, or if he stifles intellectual curiosity instead of kindling it? It has often been said: "It is more important to teach the child than to teach a subject." But you can teach the child only by teaching him something. When Socrates was told that so-and-so was a "good man" he inquired: "Good for what?" It simply doesn't make sense to call a man a good teacher until you tell what he is a teacher of. And if you discover that he is a teacher of a body of knowledge to which he has not himself contributed, you had better be skeptical about his being a good teacher at all.

If you set out to get a good teacher rather than a good scholar you are likely to get a person of one of two types, both of which are lamentably numerous in American faculties. I refer to the perpetual adolescent and to the mere entertainer.

The plain truth is that certain men enjoy undergraduate life so much that they continue to be "college men" long after it is time to put away childish things. Such men are pretty sure to be looked up to by freshmen, just as upper classmen are, and they, in turn, keenly enjoy the obvious admiration of the freshmen. Freshmen who are taught by them tend to continue the same subject in sophomore year, and so everyone is likely to infer that here is a good teacher, although he obviously is not a good scholar. But even a perpetual adolescent finally grows older, and then each succeeding group of freshmen likes and admires him less than the last one did. Sooner or later the essential sterility of his teaching becomes evident to all.

Skill as an entertainer is an admirable thing in its proper place, and it is not out of place in the classroom if it is properly sub-

ordinated to the serious business of teaching. But the actor's eagerness for applause is proverbial, and all entertainers are prone to love praise more than truth. Many a man has started out as a scholar and yet ended his days as a provider of superficial excitement for the more indolent undergraduates and the dilettante fringe—largely female—of the university.

Now this is not an easy task that I am advocating. Recruits for our faculties have to be chosen at an early age, before they can possibly be great scholars; and there is no sure way of telling what a young man or woman will become. Nevertheless the thing is so supremely important that ample time and effort must be devoted to it. In my opinion the sifting process should begin in the freshman year. All instructors should be constantly on the lookout for promising students and some way should be devised for keeping them up to their best ability all the way through college and university. Some of those first selected will fall by the way through lack of ability or energy or sustained interest. But none of them should be allowed to drop out for financial or family reasons. We should clearly recognize that the future of the race depends precisely upon this group; they should be wards of the community as long as they continue to make good. If such a plan could be put into operation it would be much easier than it is now to make the right choice when it comes to appointing instructors.

V

Under present circumstances I submit that, as a rule, no candidate for an instructorship should be considered unless he holds the Ph.D. degree. I know that many excellent persons in and out of college faculties will emphatically disagree with that. I am familiar with the jeering accounts of absurd subjects of doctoral dissertations. I know also the claim that the grinding toil of writing a dissertation and passing a doctoral examination converts a thoroughly human undergraduate into a hopeless pedant. If you want to drive students away from freshman German or freshman mathematics, these critics say, just set a young doctor to teach the class.

Obviously the wrench of shifting from the graduate school, where all his time is devoted to matters of engrossing interest and novelty to him, back to the once familiar atmosphere of the freshman classroom, is very difficult for a young man or woman. Just because he is a recent convert to the religion of scholarship he is likely to be intolerant of the poor, benighted freshman. The young doctor needs sympathetic help from his elders, not cynical abuse.

The fact remains that the only sound way to initiate a man into scholarly activity is to have him treat exhaustively under sound supervision some small problem. It may be a problem whose solution will have wide applications, and if so, it may fairly be called an important problem. But the one essential requirement is that it shall be small enough to be completely investigated in the available time. Here is the adequate answer to the sneers at the piddling unimportance of most doctor's dissertations. How monstrously unfair to expect a young man to write a masterpiece in his first hurried year of scholarly research!

Hence I believe that the best results will generally be obtained if only doctors are appointed to instructorships. No doubt it is wise to allow room for exceptions, especially in case an outstanding graduate student, known to the appointing officer, must immediately earn some money or leave the profession.

The possession of a doctor's degree, however, is not a guaranty of a man's scholarship. Such a requirement must be only a minimum.

High praise by a candidate's former teachers is notoriously misleading, but with experience one finally comes to distinguish pretty well between discriminating and indiscriminate praise. Finally, I do not see how any man dares appoint an instructor without a personal interview.

But with the best will in the world you can not be sure of your man when you appoint him. You must watch his development for a longer or shorter period before that is possible. Some will show almost at once that they have the divine spark, and they should be promptly promoted, without waiting for any pre-determined *cursus honorum*. Others develop more slowly, and they must be given plenty of time. It is the height of cruelty to

nag a young man about the need for publishing something, when he knows that his ideas are not yet ripe. Instead of urging him to do anything in particular, try to find out what sort of problem interests him and how he reacts when such a problem is posed. If no problems interest him, get rid of him as soon as possible; but if some do, give him five or six years, if need be, to get started.

VI

So far I have been talking as if the problem were purely a matter of choice on the part of appointing officers, and at present there is, Heaven knows, no dearth of candidates for academic positions. It can not be assumed, however, that all the most gifted young people gravitate toward our profession under present conditions. They certainly do not. The grinding poverty of college professors has been so well advertised that many a young man chooses the law although he would prefer to be a historian.

Now what should be done to attract such a young man or to hold a professor of history who is invited to Washington? Most emphatically I say that professors' salaries ought not to be raised. In many schools they are too high already. My salary is too high, and probably half of the professors in this room get more than I do. I see no reason why scholars should expect to live like bankers or movie actors. The community bestows upon us the most satisfying occupation known to man, and if we receive enough besides to live in a six-room apartment, with little or no service, with means for a little travel, the necessary books, an occasional evening at the theater, and a margin for gradual saving against sickness and old age, that is enough. If a professor of history or economics occasionally goes to Washington, let's not worry. If he is any good, he'll be sorry he went before the year is out.

The place where salaries need raising is at the bottom. American instructors and assistant professors are shamefully exploited, and we professors ought to put a stop to it—as we can easily do whenever we care to resign a proper proportion of our salaries to our younger colleagues.

Perhaps even more needed is the abolishment of fees in the graduate schools. There is no good reason why the opportunity

to train for an academic career should be made dependent upon being born in a well-to-do family. It is this socially unwise procedure that operates most powerfully to keep the best brains out of our profession.

Now don't misunderstand me. I am not urging a large increase in the enrolment in the graduate schools. A relaxation of financial requirements should be accompanied by a more careful choice of candidates for admission and a great increase in the number of dismissals during the first year of graduate study.

One other thing should be done to make our profession attractive. After two or three years' service every assistant professor should be given tenure. By that time it should be possible to make a final decision about a man's fitness for the academic career. It may be that he will not prove good enough for further promotion, but he should now be definitely told that he has found his niche in life or that he has not.

I speak feelingly on this point, since I was dismissed from a university after several years' service as an assistant professor. I was informed that my department was overstaffed; but an additional instructor was employed in that department for the next academic year. What the real reason was I do not know to this day. I submit that such things are outrageous, but they are not very rare. A similar case was recently investigated by Committee A of the American Association of University Professors, but far more numerous are the cases that are never reported by the victims. They conclude, as I did, that they will have a better chance to get back into academic life if they avoid publicity.

But these are details—very utopian details too, no doubt. The important thing is to find scholars to carry on a noble tradition. I know perfectly well that no amount of searching can fill all our academic posts with great scholars; there aren't enough to go around. Fortunately, however, one truly great scholar can leaven a whole faculty; while the college that hasn't even one is a detriment to the community.

THE ACADEMIC PROCESS IN A CHANGING WORLD

By F. R. AUMANN

The Ohio State University

The central fact of the twentieth century is the impact of technological change upon existing forms and ways of life. Scientific discoveries and constantly changing mechanical processes are remaking the world. To adjust the older forms of society to the demands of the new technology imposes a task upon this generation of the greatest magnitude. In making these adjustments two important tendencies are discernible which directly affect the academic process. They are (1) the tendency toward an ever-increasing centralization of political power; and (2) a corresponding tendency toward a common control of human thinking; a control which brooks little diversity of opinion or thought, since such diversity might be "dangerous" to the order. These tendencies are apparent in all political, social, and economic environments in one way or another. Their effect is most strikingly illustrated, however, in those areas where the technological imperative has produced immediate political programs involving a complete integration of forms of social control and coordination in some powerful center.

For example, both communism and fascism, the systems now competing with the democratic form, project a program of social action which requires a high degree of centralized political control. Both systems employ methods and techniques of control which involve the use of stark, unchecked power. Both systems demand a complete control of the thoughts and actions of their peoples, and both reduce the academic process to a meaningless form of words; and the rôle of the academician to complete futility. This seems inevitable. Where the whole political and social order is predicated on a philosophy which can not be challenged and this philosophy is implemented by a highly organized "propaganda" which undertakes to guide, shape, and control the whole behavior

pattern of a people, the academic process is doomed to destruction and the academician goes with it. If he refuses to abdicate his principles he must flee the land, or take the consequences.

In the democratic states which have not as yet devised "crisis techniques" the liberal formula of social reconstruction by gradual process still obtains. This necessarily involves the give and take of conflicting views, interests, and demands. Where this condition continues to exist there can be no reasonable basis for apprehension concerning the future of the academic process. Nevertheless, there are those who contend that liberalism can not meet the needs of the day. In this view, a power age needs adequate political power, and the needs of the age will not be fulfilled until a strong, masterful executive state, of one character or the other, is set up. Then, it is asserted, and only then, something can and will be done about the pressing problems raised by technological changes. In the meantime the inhibitions of liberalism will preclude any adequate treatment of these problems.

II

Among the important "inhibitions" referred to here would be the several "freedoms" including, of course, the freedom to pursue the truth wherever it may lead, which is the essence of the "academic process." Up to date, the rapid tempo of social change produced by the technological advance has had little effect upon this "freedom" in the United States. Nevertheless, it can not remain completely unaffected by those movements which have restricted its exercise elsewhere. Moreover, there are a number of signs visible which indicate that the academic process in the near future may encounter some increasing difficulty and that the rôle of the academician may become somewhat restricted also. Some recent legislative trends are of interest in this connection, in appraising the nature and extent of the critical spirit which has manifested itself toward both the academic process and the academician.

During 1935 alone, more than 75 gag laws were introduced in the 44 state legislatures which met. Fourteen of these measures were passed. Two of these, the Michigan Sedition Law, and the New Jersey "Anti-Nazi Law," make criminal the utterance of

mere opinions. Seven of the measures passed require loyalty oaths from teachers and four bar from the ballot those who teach "force and violence" and "sedition or treason." The teachers' oath bills are particularly significant. They were introduced in the legislatures of 16 states. Defeated by legislative action in Connecticut, Florida, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Illinois, Iowa, and Kansas, they were vetoed by governors in Delaware and Maryland. Incidentally, an unsuccessful attempt was made in the national House of Representatives to pass a resolution calling on the states to enact these laws. The states which passed laws requiring teachers to swear an oath to the Constitution were: Arizona, Georgia, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, Texas, and Vermont. The addition of this group brought the number of states with statutes of this kind up to 21. Of this number, six states passed such bills in the first two post-war years (1919-1921) and six more passed such laws in 1931. Ten of these laws cover teachers in private and parochial schools as well as public schools, and four of them apply to aliens as well as citizens. In Arizona and Georgia, Michigan and Vermont, they affect not only teachers in public schools but those in private and parochial schools as well. Michigan's law is unique in that students of state institutions are compelled under the law to take the oath. A similar student bill in New York was defeated by the vigorous opposition of undergraduate groups.

Other evidences of a distrustful attitude are also at hand. The series of legislative investigations of conditions which have taken place in the Universities of Wisconsin, Chicago, and Michigan come to mind in this connection. All of these activities were conducted in such a manner as to indicate clearly the presence of a deep-seated suspicion of the university as a hotbed of left-wing sentiment. When an attempt was made in 1934 to make the University of Wisconsin an issue in the political campaign of that year, it represented another effort to fan the flames of popular distrust of the schools and universities. During the Wirt investigation, when charges were made against the "brain trust," it was intimated that the university radicals had captured the government and were engaged in sovietizing America. Afterwards, efforts were made in various quarters to keep alive a considerable

public suspicion that had been aroused in connection with Rexford Guy Tugwell and all his works. This particular professor was used as a convenient symbol for all academic radicalism. He was frequently painted as a very dangerous force in our national life, exploiting social and economic distress to further the movement toward collectivism. Charges of radicalism directed against prominent educators in connection with the administration of the public schools of the District of Columbia are products of this same formula; as were the charges made by Mrs. Albert W. Dilling in her *Red Network: a 'Who's Who' and Handbook of Radicalism for Patriots*, which contained an elaborate roster of so-called "red" professors.

Much of the criticism, it will be observed, emanates from "right-wing" sources. But criticisms from the "left-wing" are just as active and are expressed in terms equally forceful. When conservatives berate the universities as breeding places of dangerous and subversive radical doctrines, the "left-wing" groups are likely to castigate the universities bitterly as the abject tools of the dominant interests in the existing social order. From this point of view, the universities are filled with "kept" scholars who are interested only in justifying and preserving the *status quo ante*. "Left-wing" critics who do not go this far will at least decry the "sterile intellectualism" of the universities which is not hitched to the wagon of an immediate and purposeful program of action.

III

These criticisms are not surprising. In times of relative social stability, our schools and universities are vulnerable. With the entire field of ideas as their province, they inevitably express attitudes and points of view which will conflict with many important divisions of public opinion and draw down upon their heads the fire of such interest-groups as have been antagonized. When the social order is in turmoil, their position becomes exceedingly difficult. When bitterly competing ideologies are struggling for control of the social order, attempts to capture the schools are to be expected since the success of any political or social theory must largely depend in its ultimate form on what the youth

of the land is taught. This fact is demonstrated by conditions in Nazi Germany, Soviet Russia, and Fascist Italy, where the schools are used directly to project and strengthen the ideas of the régime in power.

If the period of social conflict in which we are living is extended, it is reasonable to suppose that the volume of criticism will increase as the men from the universities and schools are brought more closely into the struggle. Nor is it likely that all of this criticism will be without basis. For the academic group is composed of many individuals, highly variable individuals, and with different interests, points of view, temperaments, backgrounds, ranges of ability, imagination, mental balance, and judgment. Some are broad of scope, some are narrow. Some resemble Veblen, whose range of scholarship was unusual, others spend their lives in the narrow, imprisoning, high-cliffed canyons of some special interest. Some have "no beliefs in panaceas and almost none in sudden ruin." With Holmes and Montesquieu, they believe that if the chance of battle or the passage of a law has ruined a state, there was a general cause at work which could not be denied. Others, like members of Dean Swift's "Grand Academy of Lagado," are certain that the future hinges on the idea, plan, or principle with which they are concerned. Some are influenced wholly by that "irrational passion for dispassionate rationalism," which the economist Frank Knight puts so much emphasis on, while others may abdicate all too quickly those canons of scientific objectivity and precision so necessary for their craft in the unequal competition with the evangelical fervor which moves them. Such a highly variable group as this is bound to draw the fire of critics in one way or another.

Under any condition it seems clear that the difficult question of the proper relationship of the academic process to the life that swirls around it will become an increasingly important one. For the academician is in many ways our greatest social asset. Without him and his ideas, stagnation would soon set in. In the past he has paved the way for many of our social advances; in the future we shall depend upon his ingenuity, imagination, and skill for new contrivances to make life manageable. He will always be required to play a leading rôle in formulating our social and politi-

cal policies. As social tensions intensify, however, it seems that he will have to reappraise the nature of his function and clarify his position. It would seem that he must either take his stand with those who decry the "sterile intellectualism" of the universities and hitch his wagon to one of the several quite conflicting programs of action which modern technological change has presented to us, or, like Emerson and Veblen, remain removed from those "compulsions for immediacy" which direct participation in the political and social life of the day seems to find necessary. Emerson, it will be remembered, would commit himself to no party and to no cult. Like Veblen, he remained aloof from "the daily dust of life." Veblen's attitude of remoteness, of completely scientific objectivity, suggested the interests of a man from another world. He viewed the passing scene, says Dorfman, "with a detachment that was Olympian in character."

IV

If history is read aright, it would seem that the academician would do well to reassert the position of detachment ascribed to Veblen. For his task requires a complete freedom to range. Concerned with ideas he must follow wherever they lead. He may leave the beaten pathway, wander far afield, and become hopelessly lost in the process, or he may move straight ahead in quick, decisive marches to the high places where it would be most desirable for the masses to be and where they will arrive after a long, slow, toilsome journey. If the responsibility for immediate action rests upon him, however, he is lost, as his thinking is interfered with, hemmed in, or borne down upon by such pressures. While it is contended by some that the acceptance of such a rôle will tend to restrict his opportunities to affect action, this does not seem altogether true. In fact, it is possible that he will influence action to a much greater extent if he succeeds in preserving his freedom to do a good job of thinking. "Read the work of the great German jurists," advises Mr. Justice Holmes, "and see how much more the world is governed today by Kant than by Napoleon." If the academician produces ideas of value, they will probably be adopted. It is a truism that few men can produce ideas but many men can put them into effect. Socrates, it will be remembered, looked upon

the state as "a great and noble steed, who is tardy in his motions owing to his great size" and requires to be "stirred to life." If the academician produces the ideas there will be many who will quickly seize upon them and stir the nation to action.

If the traditional rôle of the academician is changed to one of direct participation as a result of the collision between forces tending to the "right" and to the "left," it would seem that the function of the schools and universities will be vitally impaired. For when most of the philosophies of the day are tied in with a purposeful program of action, they demand the whole man without reservations. The schools and universities of the country will find great difficulty with any such demand as this for their primary requirements are freedom to teach, freedom to learn, and freedom to investigate. When these conditions are denied their history shows full well that stagnation and failure result. If they can not pursue the truth wherever the trail may lead, they may as well close their doors. For if the history of ideas demonstrates anything, it is that "the best test of truth," as Mr. Justice Holmes remarks, "is the power of thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market."

In our attempts to meet these difficult problems, some food for thought may be derived from the suggestion of A. Lawrence Lowell, the President Emeritus of Harvard University. "The great need of the present day," remarks this seasoned student of university problems and public affairs, "is wisdom, the calm, unimpassioned search for enduring truth, not so much concerned with immediate action as with the slow adjustment of human relations. . . . Where shall wisdom be found and where is the place of understanding? Surely it should be where the pressure of interests is lowest, where passion should be least inflamed, where men are most free to think and write their own thoughts, where the anxieties of the present do not exclude the contemplation of the past and the drawing therefrom a horoscope of the possibilities of the future." If our problems are resolved or can be resolved in something of the spirit of President Lowell's suggestion there can be some hope that the academic process will come through this period of difficult social adjustment strong and unimpaired.

ORGANIZATION AND POLICY

REPORT OF COMMITTEE O

The Committee on Organization and Policy finds its task this year relatively simple as compared with that of previous years in view of the fact that the many important amendments of the Association's organic law adopted a year ago completed for the time being the Committee's program for democratization of the Association's procedures. The new methods of nomination and election of Council members thus adopted have yet to be tested by experience, and it seems the part of wisdom to await the outcome of that experience before undertaking further changes in fundamental procedures. There are, however, several matters which need to be dealt with and which require amendments to the Constitution.

I

Perhaps the most important question which presents itself for consideration at this time is whether members of the faculties of "independent junior colleges" should be made eligible for election to membership in the Association. A suggestion that this be done was presented to the Council a year ago and referred by that body to Committee O. At the April meeting of the Council, Committee O asked for discussion and expression of opinion by the members of the Council. After considerable discussion a vote was taken and nearly all the members of the Council were found to be in favor of the proposal to admit members of the faculties of the institutions in question.

Article II, Section 2, of the Constitution governs eligibility to Active membership. It reads as follows: "Any university or college teacher or investigator who holds, and for two years has held, a position of teaching or research in a university or college (not including independent junior colleges) in the United States or Canada, or in the discretion of the Council in an American-controlled institution situated abroad, or in a professional school

of similar grade, may be nominated for membership in the Association."

It will be seen that the only Constitutional amendment necessary, if the suggestion referred to is to be carried out, is to strike out the words "not including independent junior colleges." In order to permit the matter to be voted on this year Committee O in Appendix I submits the necessary Constitutional amendment (p. 434).

It should be noted that, under the provisions of Section 7 of Article II of the Constitution, the Council has "power to construe the provisions governing eligibility for membership." Under this section the Council will have power to construe the provisions of Section 2 of Article II, so as to insure that only "junior colleges" with adequate standards will be placed upon the list of institutions from which members may be elected. It would seem that this power of the Council is an answer to doubts which have been raised as to whether or not many so-called "junior colleges" actually measure up to the standards which our Association should require. The Committee therefore recommends the adoption of the amendment.

II

In its report last year the Committee overlooked the fact that the adoption of an amendment to Article II, Section 3, relating to Junior Members, under which those members are automatically transferred to Active membership as soon as they become eligible, would render superfluous Section 5 of Article IV. That section reads: "On fulfilling the requirements of Article II, a Junior Member may, on recommendation of the Committee on Admissions, be transferred to Active membership."

In Appendix II the Committee submits the necessary proposal for the amendment of the Constitution, deleting this section (p. 434).

III

It has been suggested to the Committee that Emeritus and Junior Members ought to be allowed to vote at Annual Meetings and to hold national office. The two classes need separate dis-

cussion. (a) Article II, Section 5, provides: "Emeritus Members. Any Active Member retiring for age from a position in teaching or research may be transferred, at his own request and with the approval of the Council, to Emeritus membership." Under the provisions of Article VII, Section 2, Emeritus Members pay no dues. It is the opinion of the Committee that Active Members who exercise the option to be transferred to this class of membership (note that the transfer is not compulsory) and who thereby cease to pay dues ought not to retain the right to vote and hold office. The Committee therefore recommends no change in their status. (b) Article II, Section 3, reads: "Junior Members. Any university or college teacher or investigator who is eligible for Active membership, except in respect to length of service, and any person who is, or within the past five years has been, a graduate student is eligible for nomination as a Junior Member."

In view of the fact that Junior Members may be graduate students or other persons not holding a position of teaching or research on a college or university faculty, the Committee is of the opinion that not all Junior Members should have the right to vote and hold office. It may be that Junior Members who are university or college teachers or investigators should have these rights. Giving them these rights would make them to all intents and purposes Active Members, and the only remaining distinction between such (so-called) Junior Members and Active Members would be in the amount of dues, the former paying three dollars and the latter four.

In view of these facts a majority of the Committee recommends the following amendments to the Constitution: (1) Strike out the requirement for Active membership that the candidate shall have held for at least two years a position of teaching or research in an institution on the eligible list. The effect will be to make eligible for Active membership any teacher or investigator who holds a position of teaching or research in an acceptable institution of higher learning, irrespective of length of service. The Committee believes that bringing these younger members into active participation in the affairs of the Association would be a wise step, and sees no ground for believing that the adoption of these amendments carries with it any serious danger to the Association, now that its

membership is so large and its traditions so firmly established. (2) Strike out of the section dealing with Junior membership that part which relates to persons holding positions of teaching or research. The effect will be to confine eligibility for Junior membership to graduate students or persons who have recently been graduate students. These obviously ought not to be allowed to vote or hold office.

The text of the necessary amendments to bring about these changes will be found in Appendix III (pp. 434-435).

IV

In the interest of uniformity of style, Article II, Section 4, should be rephrased without change of substance. It now reads: "Associate Members shall include those members who, ceasing to be eligible for Active or Junior membership, because their work has become primarily administrative, are transferred with the approval of the Council to Associate membership."

The necessary amendment to bring the wording into conformity with the preceding sections of the same article will be found in Appendix IV (p. 435).

V

A similar change needs to be made for the same reason in Article II, Section 5. The needed amendment will be found in Appendix V (p. 435).

VI

The first sentence of Article III, Section 2, reads as follows: "The term of office of the President and the Vice-Presidents shall be two years, that of the elective members of the Council three years, ten elective members retiring annually, but if in any year the terms of the President and both Vice-Presidents expire simultaneously, one of the latter may be designated by the Council to serve an additional year."

The General Secretary points out that under the present provisions of the Constitution the terms of office of the President and the two Vice-Presidents always expire simultaneously, so that the latter part of the sentence in question seems without significance.

On the recommendation of the General Secretary a majority of the Committee recommends the adoption of an amendment deleting all that part of the sentence immediately following the words "retiring annually." See Appendix VI (p. 435).

VII

Article IV, Section 2, requires the signatures of three members of the Association for a nomination for membership. On the recommendation of the General Secretary, the Committee prepares an amendment which will allow a single Active Member to nominate a person for membership. In suggesting such an amendment to the Committee, General Secretary Himstead wrote as follows: "This provision as it now stands requiring the signatures of three members to all nominations is, I am convinced, a big handicap in increasing the Association's membership. The list of all nominees is, pursuant to a constitutional provision, published in the *Bulletin*, and the entire membership is thereby given an opportunity to protest any nominee. Such protests are considered by the Committee on Admissions."

For the reason given by the General Secretary, the Committee recommends the adoption of the amendment, the text of which will be found in Appendix VII (p. 436).

VIII

In Article V, Section 2, there appears this sentence: "It [the Council] shall present a written report to the Association at the Annual Meeting." During recent years the record of all Council meetings has been published in the *Bulletin*, so that a report to the Annual Meeting serves no purpose. The Committee concurs with the General Secretary in recommending an amendment which will merely require that the Council record be printed in the *Bulletin*. See Appendix VIII (p. 436) for the precise text of the amendment.

IX

In Article VII of the Constitution, which deals with termination of membership, there is no provision for termination by resignation. On the advice of the General Secretary, the Committee

recommends the addition to Article VII of a new section specifically dealing with the matter. See Appendix IX (p. 436) for the text of the amendment.

Proposed Constitutional Amendments

Appendix I

Amend Article II, Section 2, of the Constitution by striking out the provision in parentheses, *i. e.* "(not including independent junior colleges)," so that as amended the section will read: "2. Active Members. Any university or college teacher or investigator who holds, and for two years has held, a position of teaching or research in a university or college in the United States or Canada, or in the discretion of the Council in an American-controlled institution situated abroad, or in a professional school of similar grade, may be nominated for membership in the Association. At the discretion of the Committee on Admissions, service in foreign institutions may also be counted toward the two-year requirement."

Appendix II

Amend Article IV of the Constitution by striking out the whole of Section 5, which reads: "On fulfilling the requirements of Article II, a Junior Member may, on recommendation of the Committee on Admissions, be transferred to Active membership."

Appendix III

(a) Amend Article II, Section 2, of the Constitution by deleting from the first sentence of the section the words "and for two years has held," deleting the commas immediately preceding and following these words, inserting the word "Active" between the words "for" and "membership," and deleting the last sentence of the section which now becomes obsolete. Assuming the amendment in Appendix I is also adopted, the section as amended will read: "Any university or college teacher or investigator who holds a position of teaching or research in a university or college in the United States or Canada, or in the discretion of the Council, in an American-

controlled institution situated abroad, or in a professional school of similar grade, may be nominated for Active membership in the Association."

(b) Amend Article II, Section 3, of the Constitution relating to Junior Members, by striking out the provision relating to university or college teachers or investigators, and in the interest of uniformity, substituting the words "may be nominated for Junior membership" for the words "is eligible for nomination to Junior membership." As amended the section will read: "3. Junior Members. Any person who is, or within the past five years has been, a graduate student may be nominated for Junior membership. Junior Members shall be transferred to Active membership as soon as they become eligible."

Appendix IV

Strike out Section 4 of Article II of the Constitution and substitute the following: "4. Associate Members. Any member who ceases to be eligible for Active or Junior membership because his work has become primarily administrative may be transferred with the approval of the Council to Associate membership."

Appendix V

Strike out Section 5 of Article II of the Constitution and substitute the following: "5. Emeritus Members. Any Active Member retiring for age from a position in teaching or research may be transferred at his own request and with the approval of the Council to Emeritus membership."

Appendix VI

In the first sentence of Section 2 of Article III of the Constitution, delete the words "but if in any year the terms of the President and both Vice-Presidents expire simultaneously, one of the latter may be designated by the Council to serve an additional year." Also change the comma after the word "annually" to a period. The sentence as amended will read: "The term of office of the President and the Vice-Presidents shall be two years, that of the elective members of the Council three years, ten elective members retiring annually."

Appendix VII

Amend Section 2 of Article IV of the Constitution by changing the word "three" to "one," by changing "members" to "Member," and inserting the word "Active" immediately before the word "Member." As amended the section will read: "Nominations for Active and Junior membership may be made to the General Secretary of the Association by any one Active Member of the Association."

Appendix VIII

In Section 2 of Article V of the Constitution, strike out the third sentence, which reads: "It shall present a written report to the Association at the Annual Meeting," and substitute the following: "It shall publish in the *Bulletin* a record of each meeting."

Appendix IX

Add to Article VII a new section, numbered 5, as follows:
 "5. A member desiring to terminate his membership may do so by a resignation communicated to the General Secretary."

WALTER W. COOK (Law), Northwestern University, *Chairman*
 WILLIAM M. HEPBURN (Law), University of Alabama
 EDWARD C. KIRKLAND (History), Bowdoin College
 KIRK H. PORTER (Political Science), State University of Iowa
 FRANCIS J. TSCHAN (History), Pennsylvania State College

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Pursuant to By-Law No. 1, the Nominating Committee submits its list of nominees for the elective offices falling vacant at the close of 1939.¹ The members of the Nominating Committee are Professors William F. Edgerton, University of Chicago, *Chairman*; William Anderson, University of Minnesota; J. Hobart Bushey, Hunter College; Richard H. Shryock, University of Pennsylvania; and William O. Sypherd, University of Delaware. The list is as follows:

President

Frederick Shipp Deibler, Economics, Northwestern University
(Charter member;² Chap. Pres., 1921-22; Council, 1917-19;
Com. on Academic Freedom and Tenure, 1920-35, *Chm.*,
1920-21; Com. on Pensions and Insurance, 1921-29; Nomi-
nating Com., 1935)

First Vice-President

John Q. Stewart, Astronomy, Physics, Princeton University
(Elected 1924;² Chap. Pres., 1933-36)

Second Vice-President

Laura A. White, History, University of Wyoming
(Elected 1921; Chap. Pres., 1935-36; Council, 1936-38)

¹ In accordance with Council action, a brief biographical sketch of each nominee will be published in the December *Bulletin* and on the ballots.

² Refers in this and each following statement to the date of election to Association membership.

Members of the Council for 1940-42¹**DISTRICT I**

- Helen Sard Hughes, English Literature, Wellesley College
(Elected 1921; Com. on Requirements for the Master of Arts
Degree, 1931-33)
Elbridge Churchill Jacobs, Geology, University of Vermont
(Elected 1916; Chap. Secy., 1930-37; Chap. Pres., 1939-)

DISTRICT II

- Horatio Smith, French, Columbia University
(Elected 1920)
John Whyte, German, Brooklyn College
(Elected 1925; Chap. Secy., 1932-36)

DISTRICT III

- R. Clifton Gibbs, Physics, Cornell University
(Elected 1923)
Roy F. Nichols, History, University of Pennsylvania
(Elected 1926; Chap. Secy., 1937-38)

DISTRICT IV

- H. L. Osterud, Anatomy, Medical College of Virginia
(Elected 1929; Chap. Pres., 1931-)
Richard J. Purcell, History, Catholic University
(Elected 1930; Chap. Pres., 1938-)

DISTRICT V

- Harald S. Patton, Economics, Michigan State College
(Elected 1932; Chap. Pres. 1933-35)
P. K. Whelpton, Population, Miami University
(Elected 1931)

DISTRICT VI

- Thomas F. Green, Jr., Law, University of Georgia
(Elected 1932; Chap. Pres., 1938-39)
Marie J. Weiss, Mathematics, Tulane University of Louisiana
(Sophie Newcomb College)
(Elected 1933)

¹ One from each district to be elected.

DISTRICT VII

Fowler V. Harper, Law, Indiana University
(Elected 1929)

Charles O. Lee, Pharmacy, Purdue University
(Elected 1920; Chap. Secy., 1932-33; Chap. Pres., 1937-39)

DISTRICT VIII

G. W. Martin, Botany, State University of Iowa
(Elected 1922; Chap. Secy., 1928-29)

Edgar B. Wesley, Education, University of Minnesota
(Elected 1937)

DISTRICT IX

Wilby T. Gooch, Chemistry, Baylor University
(Elected 1933; Chap. Pres., 1937-38)

John Ise, Economics, University of Kansas
(Elected 1920; Com. on Economic Condition of Profession,
1935-)

DISTRICT X

Bennet M. Allen, Zoology, University of California at Los Angeles
(Elected 1916; Chap. Pres. 1934-35)

Frank L. Griffin, Mathematics, Reed College
(Elected 1916; Chap. Pres., 1936-37; Com. on Organization
and Conduct of Chapters, 1938-)

ASSOCIATION NEWS

Annual Meeting

The twenty-sixth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors will be held in New Orleans, Louisiana, on Wednesday and Thursday, December 27 and 28. Headquarters for the meeting will be at the Jung Hotel.

The first session will begin at 2:00 P. M. on December 27. There will be a dinner on the evening of December 27 and a luncheon on December 28. The meeting will be preceded by a session of the Council during the morning of December 27 and followed by sessions of the Council on December 29.

The program will consist of committee reports, addresses, and symposia on subjects of professional concern to all college and university teachers. Among these subjects are academic freedom and tenure, policies and procedures of the Association, freedom of speech, and place and function of faculties in college and university government. The full program will be published in the December issue of the *Bulletin*. In the meantime, as soon as it is completed, copies will be sent to all chapter officers for presentation to chapters.

The Association is meeting in connection with the fifty-sixth Annual Meeting of the Modern Language Association, which will be held on December 28-30, with headquarters at the Roosevelt Hotel. Special groups of that Association will discuss "The Relations of Literature and Science" and "The Relations of Literature and Society."

Washington Office

The increasing volume of work in the Washington office, particularly that of Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure, made it necessary, in the opinion of the Council, either to greatly limit the Association's professional services or to increase personnel. The Council chose the latter course and at its April,

1939, meeting authorized the appointment of an associate to the General Secretary. Upon nomination of the General Secretary, the Council appointed Dr. Paul W. Ward. His appointment became effective August 15.

Dr. Ward is known to many members of the Association as the present Chairman of Committee T on Place and Function of Faculties in College and University Government. This chairmanship he will, for the present, continue to hold. His acceptance of the Associate Secretaryship makes it possible for the research and consultation carried on by this committee to be more closely articulated with the other phases of the Association's work, particularly that of Committee A, than previously has been possible.

Dr. Ward is the author of several books in the field of social and political theory and is co-author of a textbook in logic and orientation. His degrees are A.B., Butler University, 1914; A.M., Columbia University, 1916; Diploma, Union Theological Seminary, 1917; Ph.D., Columbia University, 1928. He was a pursuit pilot in the United States Air Service during the World War and, following the war, was a student at the London School of Economics and Political Science. During 1939-1940, he is on leave of absence from his duties as Professor and Chairman of the Department of Philosophy in Syracuse University where he has taught since 1922.

Announcement

Chapters of the Association in New Jersey and Pennsylvania will hold a regional meeting in Atlantic City, New Jersey, on Saturday, November 25, 1939. The meeting is planned for the afternoon as a concluding feature of the Fifty-third Annual Convention of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and affiliated associations.

The tentative program includes a discussion of "The Pros and Cons of NYA Assistance in the Colleges," and "The Outlook for Higher Education in Pennsylvania." A detailed program will be included in the general program of the Middle States Association.

The committee on arrangements includes Professors Thomas D. Cope of the University of Pennsylvania and Scott B. Lilly of

Swarthmore College, presidents of their respective chapters, and Professor F. J. Tschan of Pennsylvania State College, member for the region of the Association's Committee on Organization and Conduct of Chapters. The committee wishes it to be known that all members of the Association are invited to attend the meeting.

Membership Records

The annual letter of inquiry regarding possible changes in status or transfers in positions of members was sent to all chapters early in October. Every member of the Association is urged to help in checking this essential information and reporting any such changes or transfers either to chapter officers or directly to the General Secretary. During 1940 there will be published a directory of members, and it will be very helpful if between now and the time of publication of this directory the membership records are kept as accurate as possible.

In this connection, information is desired concerning the present address of each of the following members for whom mail is returned by the postoffice marked "address unknown":

<i>Name</i>	<i>Last University Connection</i>	<i>Last Address</i>
Bailey, Daniel	(Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn)	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Eisenbrown, Harry	(Princeton University)	Berlin, Germany
Fouré, Jacqueline H.	(Connecticut College)	New London, Conn.
Hanrahan, Francis J.	(Pennsylvania State College)	State College, Pa.
Holmes, Lawrence R.	(University of Maryland)	College Park, Md.
Manheim, Frank J.	(Union University)	Schenectady, N. Y.
Parker, Sophy D.	(State University of Iowa)	Lebanon, Ill.
Thompson, Charles D., Jr.	(Georgia State College for Women)	Milledgeville, Ga.
Wilson, Raymond H., Jr.	(Gettysburg College)	Gettysburg, Pa.
Yeselson, Gertrude	(Ohio University)	Athens, Ohio

Representatives

The following members accepted the General Secretary's invitation to represent the American Association of University Professors on the occasions indicated:

Jean Pierre Le Coq (Drake University) at the inauguration of Dr. John Owen Gross as President of Simpson College, April 22.

Richard J. Purcell (Catholic University of America) at the

Sesquicentennial Celebration of Georgetown University, May 28-June 5.

Fred W. Emerson (New Mexico Normal University) at the Celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Founding of the University of New Mexico, June 4-5.

Regional Meetings

Aberdeen, South Dakota

A regional meeting of the Association was held on May 12 and 13 at Northern State Teachers College, Aberdeen, South Dakota. The following institutions were represented by a total attendance of approximately 50 persons: Dakota Wesleyan University, Huron College, Jamestown College, Morningside College, University of Nebraska, North Dakota State Normal and Industrial School, North Dakota Agricultural College, and the University of South Dakota.

Centering around the general theme, "Raising and Maintaining Standards in Higher Institutions," the meeting was comprised of three sessions. Addresses were presented on the following topics: "What the State Department Can Do to Raise and Maintain Standards," Dr. John F. Hines, Superintendent of South Dakota Public Instruction; "A Study in Curricula for Teacher Training," Professor M. F. Tostlebe, Northern State Teachers College; "An Exploration as to the Present Situation of Standards of Higher Institutions," Professor A. L. Keith, University of South Dakota; "Raising and Maintaining Standards," Professor D. A. Worcester, University of Nebraska; "Sharing the Best with Our Neighbors," Professor Alice Brethorst, Dakota Wesleyan University; "Raising and Maintaining Other Standards than Academic," Professor M. E. Graber, Morningside College; and a discussion of "The Place of the Faculty Council or Senate in Raising and Maintaining Standards," led by Professor Emeline L. Welsh, Northern State Teachers College.

Gainesville, Florida

An annual joint meeting of the chapters of the University of Florida and of Florida State College for Women was held at a

luncheon on Sunday, April 30, in Gainesville. Members from Rollins College and John B. Stetson University also attended the meeting which was presided over by Professor Manning J. Dauer, president of the University of Florida chapter. Approximately 100 persons were in attendance.

Devoted largely to a discussion of academic freedom and tenure, the program included a report by Professor Cecil G. Phipps of the activity of the University chapter in interesting the Board of Control in approving a definite statement of policy for both of the state institutions. Following this report, President John J. Tigert of the University spoke on tenure, freedom of teaching, and freedom of speech. He indicated his support of the revised statement on academic freedom and tenure adopted by the American Association of University Professors and before the Association of American Colleges for similar adoption.

Professor Earl L. Vance of the State College, and a member of the Association's Council, addressed the meeting on "Academic Freedom and Tenure: The Profession's Own Part" (see pp. 408-413).

The subject of extra-curricular activities was presented in brief talks by Professor C. F. Byers of the University and by Professor Anna Forbes Liddell of the State College.

Hamilton, New York

The sixth annual central New York meeting for Region 2 was held on May 13, 1939, at Hamilton, New York, under the auspices of the Colgate University chapter.

Approximately 100 representatives from the faculties of the following institutions were in attendance: Alfred University, University of Buffalo, Colgate University, Cornell University, Elmira College, Hamilton College, Hartwick College, Hobart College, Keuka College, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, University of Rochester, Russell Sage College, St. Lawrence University, Skidmore College, Syracuse University, Union College, and Vassar College.

Dr. Ralph E. Himstead, General Secretary of the Association, was the speaker of the occasion. His subject was "Academic Tenure." In the course of his address, he explained the salient

provisions of the 1938 statement agreed upon by representatives of the Association and of the Association of American Colleges. He emphasized the provisions of this statement as they affect particularly the welfare of the younger members of the profession, pointing out that the statement for the first time definitely disassociates tenure from rank or the financial ability of an institution to promote, and places it on the basis of satisfactory service in the profession determined during a probationary period of reasonable length. He urged the importance of the older members of the profession concerning themselves with the "welfare of younger teachers," thus "supporting the Association's several objectives, which in their totality seek to develop a strong, well-integrated, courageous profession with a desire for independence and freedom of thought, a pervading sense of responsibility for the welfare of the whole of higher education, and insight into the significance of education in a democratic society." In the course of his remarks, he stated that "the experience of the Association in investigating many cases involving considerations of academic freedom and tenure has demonstrated that without tenure security there can be no real academic freedom and without academic freedom scholarship objective to the degree essential for a society of free people is impossible."

Following Dr. Himstead's address there were brief reports from representatives of the several participating chapters on tenure rules and principles in effect at their institutions, and an open forum discussion. Members presenting statements concerning tenure were: Professors W. H. Bonner, University of Buffalo; T. S. Lawson and J. M. Shortliffe of Colgate University; A. W. Bray, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; Willson Coates, University of Rochester; and E. E. Dale, Union College.

The members of the Executive Committee of the Colgate University chapter, Professors Graydon S. De Land, H. B. Jefferson, E. W. Lyon, J. F. Fitch, C. L. Henshaw, and H. A. Brautigam, constituted the Committee on Arrangements. Professor De Land is the Committee E member for this region.

The meeting voted to accept the invitation of the Wells College chapter to hold the spring 1940 regional meeting at Aurora, New York.

New York City

The fourth annual conference of chapters of the Association in and near New York City was held on Monday, March 20, in the Men's Faculty Club of Columbia University. The conference was attended by 84 members of the Association from the following colleges and universities: Adelphi, Brooklyn, City, Colgate, Hunter, Newark State Teachers, Upsala, and Vassar Colleges, and Columbia, New York, and Yale Universities.

At the afternoon session which began at 4:00 P. M., Professor Harry J. Carman of Columbia University presided. He introduced Professor Mark H. Ingraham of the University of Wisconsin, President of the Association, who talked about the various activities of the American Association of University Professors, with especial emphasis on academic freedom and tenure and the place and function of faculties in college and university government. In the course of his remarks, he expressed interest in the democratic system of faculty organization which has recently been introduced in the New York City colleges under the jurisdiction of the Board of Higher Education. Professor Joseph Allen, former member of the Council, spoke briefly concerning the need of the Association for increased revenue. He also urged the desirability of giving publicity in the *Bulletin* to university and college teaching vacancies. Professor Graydon S. De Land of Colgate University, member of Committee E on Organization and Conduct of Chapters, told of the work of chapters in upstate New York and led a discussion on chapter activities.

A dinner meeting followed with Professor James O'Neill of Brooklyn College presiding. He introduced Professor E. H. Sturtevant of Yale University, who presented a paper on "Selection and Retention of Faculty Members" (see pp. 414-421).

Professor Ingraham spoke on the topic, "Laziness, Incompetence, and Tenure," stressing that if tenure is to have usefulness it must have these qualities: (1) it must protect academic freedom; (2) it must lend to the profession a degree of security that will attract the ablest men; and (3) it must not be so indiscriminating that it opens students to the abuse of continued instruction by men incompetent or lazy as teachers and scholars. He dis-

cussed the length of the probationary period before tenure is granted and methods of weeding out the incompetent under a system of tenure. He made clear that his primary consideration was the improvement of education and conditions for scholarship in America, expressing the hope that tenure will be used to raise teaching standards and scholarship to a higher level.

Professor Helen E. Sandison of Vassar College led the discussion which followed the two addresses. The meeting adjourned at 10:00 P. M.

The following persons constituted the Committee on Arrangements: Joseph Allen of the City College, Jewell Hughes Bushey of Hunter College, H. J. Carman of Columbia University, Virginia Harrington of Brooklyn College, Rudolf Kagey of New York University, and H. N. Wright of the City College.

Normal, Illinois

The annual state meeting of Illinois chapters was held at the Illinois State Normal University at Normal, Illinois, on May 13, with an attendance of about 100 persons representing almost every college and university in the state. Following an informal reception at 9:30 A. M., the meeting convened at 10 o'clock. The program consisted of two addresses on the subject, "The Professors Abdicated," by Professors Alpheus Smith and E. T. McSwain of Northwestern University. Their addresses were followed by a forum discussion which preceded a luncheon session. The luncheon speaker was Professor A. J. Carlson of the University of Chicago.

It was voted to form a coordinating committee for the chapters in Illinois with Professor J. M. Hughes of Northwestern University as chairman for the coming year. The committee will include one representative elected by each chapter and one member at large to represent members in schools where there are no chapters. According to present plans, the personnel of the committee will be changed annually.

Chapter Activities

Indiana University. On May 8 Professor W. W. Cook of Northwestern University attended a dinner meeting of officers and former

officers of the Indiana University chapter. In the evening at a well-attended chapter meeting, Professor Cook spoke on the subject, "The Major Achievements and Major Problems of the Association."

Michigan State College. As the closing meeting of the year, the chapter held its annual banquet on May 1 with Professor A. J. Carlson of the University of Chicago as the main speaker. Professor Carlson emphasized the purposes of the Association and challenged the membership to deal with fundamentals. Almost 100 persons participated in the meeting at which time a former president of the chapter, Professor L. C. Plant, was honored upon his retirement from teaching.

Through the excellent work of Professor S. G. Bergquist, chairman of the membership committee, the chapter closed the academic year with 93 members as compared with a membership of 54 in May, 1938.

Earlier meetings in the year were devoted to panel discussions of such subjects as the place and function of faculties in college and university government and faculty participation in college departmental administration.

Purdue University. Professor W. W. Cook of Northwestern University was the guest speaker on May 1 at a meeting of the Purdue University chapter. He addressed a group of approximately 75 persons on the subject, "The A. A. U. P.: What It Is and What It Is Not."

Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas. The chapter concluded its program for the year 1938-1939 with a capacity attendance at its annual open banquet which was held in May in cooperation with a number of other campus organizations. Dr. Homer P. Rainey, recently elected president of the University of Texas, as the guest speaker, discussed the youth problem facing the country as a whole and the institutions of higher education in particular.

Preceding meetings revolved around a series of committee reports and addresses pertinent to the activities of the Association and to those of the college. In October the committee on "Scholar-

ship Honor Society" presented an exhaustive and informative report which was followed by valuable discussion. The feature of the November meeting was an address by Dean T. D. Brooks entitled, "The Philosophy of Graduate Education at the A. & M. College of Texas." The chapter committee on "Student Tuition Fees" reported in December, giving a comparative study of fees at their college and similar colleges. In January a report which was presented on the subject of "The Cost of Textbooks to Students" included suggested methods of reduction in such costs for students at this institution. An open forum featuring certain phases of cooperation was held in February under the title of "Stretching the Professor's Income." Speakers at this meeting were Professor Daniel Russell, Head of the Department of Rural Sociology, who reviewed the large housing project for students which he has directed, and Professor L. S. Paine, a member of the Federation of Federal Employees, who discussed the cooperative work of this organization and suggested further beneficial activities for the college community. In March another forum followed on "The Philosophy of Undergraduate Education" under the leadership of the librarian, Dr. T. F. Mayo, and Dean F. C. Bolton. The report of the committee on "The Influence of Student Life upon Scholarship" was presented at the April meeting.

The chapter has more than doubled its membership in the last year, and the officers report that its committees made thorough and commendable studies. Complete files of these reports are maintained by the chapter, and where the material has seemed of great value copies have been made available to the faculty or administration offices.

University of Wyoming. Professor Mark H. Ingraham of the University of Wisconsin, President of the Association, made a three-day visit to the University of Wyoming, on May 7-9. He addressed the chapter on the subject "Academic Tenure" which was of timely interest as the members of the Association have recently concerned themselves with the establishment of a tenure policy for the University. During his visit, Professor Ingraham also spoke at a Phi Beta Kappa Association meeting and at a General University Assembly.

EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION

The Congress on Education for Democracy¹

EDITORIAL NOTE: Through the courtesy of *School and Society*, it is possible to make available to our readers significant excerpts from papers presented at the Congress on Education for Democracy held in New York City, August 15-17, under the auspices of Teachers College, Columbia University. This Congress, participated in by representatives of various interests—agriculture, industry, business, labor, religious, and educational—was concerned with the twofold theme, Freedom of Representative Democracy and the Dignity and Worth of the Individual. The following excerpts were selected for *School and Society* by Harriet Shoen:

It is imperative that democracy be a real democracy, that it be participated in by the whole body of citizenship and that youth be taught that to participate in shaping and in choosing government is an imperative part of his life duty.—*Nicholas Murray Butler*.

The defense against a bad idea is a better idea; the defense against a half truth is a truth; the defense against propaganda is education; and it is in education that democracies must place their trust.—*William F. Russell*.

Founded as it is at rock bottom on the freedom, equality and personal value of the individual, the practical quality of democracy depends on the standard of development of average human beings. This insures that it can never become a rigid doctrine, because it is conceived to evolve in harmony with the normal evolution of human progress. In this respect it is unique among all social theories and can never perish.—*John M. Ciechanowski*.

No system is "democratic" if the individual has not freedom of thought, or rather its expression, freedom of access to facts (often called freedom of the press, but not quite the same thing), freedom of speech and congregation, liberty of person subject only to process of law, freedom of religious beliefs and worship—we should also

¹ Reprinted from *School and Society*, Vol. 50, No. 1288, September 2, 1939.

add a reasonable freedom of choice in occupation and location, and particularly freedom to convert, by peaceful argument, a minority into a majority opinion.—*Lord Stamp*.

It is not enough that the maxims of civil liberty be spread upon paper and celebrated by sunshine patriots. They are futile unless made dynamic in government itself. They are mere trash unless supported by citizens in daily conduct.—*Charles A. Beard*.

I count him wise and right well taught

Who can bear a horn and blow it not.—*Old English rhyme, quoted by John Murray, of Exeter, England*.

The only real education in self-government is the direct practice of it.—*Lord Eustace Percy*.

My suspicion is that in Sweden the good results are at least as much due to the teachers as to the curriculum, to their tradition of learning, their respect for books, and, not least significant, to their secure position, their civil service life tenure, their high social status, their importance in municipal affairs—all giving them an influence that ill-paid and ill-esteemed . . . teachers could never have, even giving them a possibility and a habit of free discussion and independent attitudes. Respect for education can not be born out of contempt for teachers.—*Mrs. Alva Myrdal, of Stockholm*.

. . . To make for democracy, education must deliberately combat all collective hatreds, fears and megalomaniacs. It should seek to eradicate all forms of xenophobia—the phobias against strangers—from all texts, from all instruction and from all extra-curricular activities in the schools. It should foster habits of reason and justice by enlarging the scope of civics in the secondary schools to include the study of democracy as a whole, of its implications in all human relationships, and of the dangers from which it must be protected. . . . There is nothing we Jews dread more than the cry raised by totalitarianism: "One people, one State, one Fuehrer." There is nothing we Jews yearn for more than the good tidings of Democracy announcing: "One humanity, one divine Kingdom, one God."—*Mordecai M. Kaplan*.

As the world is today, great events in one continent have their repercussions in another; no one can live out his life in a walled garden.—*Earl Baldwin of Bewdley.*

. . . No men were less revolutionary in spirit than the heroes of the American Revolution. They made a resolution in the name of Magna Charta and the Bill of Rights.—*Quoted from James Bryce's "The American Commonwealth" by Earl Baldwin of Bewdley.*

The key to responsible voluntary action is education.—*Winthrop W. Aldrich.*

Knowledge alone will not save our republican form of government. Liberty can not continue unless there is integrity and patriotic honesty in the heart of the individual. . . . Laziness, indifference or crookedness in citizenship is treason against democracy. Intellectual honesty is an essential requisite of good citizenship. Our program of education must put emphasis on character as well as intelligence.—*Louis J. Taber.*

Democracy, as we have seen, is a way of living together. It depends for its vitality upon fundamental attitudes, simple habits of action and profound convictions, rather than upon copybook maxims or particular organizational forms. It follows that the school and college can make its greatest contribution to the maintenance of democracy by offering young people a continuous experience in democratic practice. . . . No type of professional education can, of course, be the object of greater concern to those who desire the triumph of democracy than teacher education. . . . First, those should be encouraged to enter the teaching profession who have a becoming confidence in their own powers, an affectionate interest in other and especially in younger human beings, and a predisposition to reasonable conduct. That those persons should receive the type of democratic general education hitherto outlined is particularly to be desired. For it is manifestly preposterous to suppose it likely that individuals who have themselves never enjoyed freedom, never thriven in an atmosphere of affection, nor had long and convincing experience of the efficacy of rational procedures should prove readily capable of promoting democratic characteristics in others.—*Karl W. Bigelow.*

Democracy needs a longer period of growth than a standardized society planned from above. The more complex the society, the more skill the individual needs to find his unique place in it. It takes time to acquire skill. The prolongation of youth is wasteful in a state which puts material values first. The sooner they can be accumulated the better. A state which can put human values first will be glad to give individuals time to consider their potentialities. This is an expensive procedure, but human beings are worth what it costs. . . . Some colleges show the effects of a kind of academic class consciousness, which borders on intellectual snobishness. Classicist scorns vocationalist who scorns theorist who scorns practitioner. Scorn is not the atmosphere in which to grow wisdom. Too often the academic world betrays the very thing it could most easily demonstrate, the validity of a variety of educational methods to reach common educational goals. . . . Above all, democracy needs citizens who have the habit of maintaining free spirits while they voluntarily assume corporate responsibility. Colleges dedicated to the cause of truth and the welfare of youth help to produce such citizens. Such is their contribution to democracy.—*Mildred H. McAfee.*

The blessings of a republican government are not for weaklings. If children have not been taught the rigors of learning, if they have not been taught that nothing worth while can be won without mental and physical effort, they will always evade responsibility in later life. Weak men are the fodder of dictatorships.—*H. W. Prentis, Jr.*

Let us remember that the more vital the issues with which citizenship is concerned, and the more competent and vital the teacher, the more harmful it is to try to keep him in blinkers. The one thing that really is intolerable is the dull recitation in school of a lifeless corpus of irreproachable but wholly insincere sentiments when the world into which the pupil passes from his school exercises is throbbing with powerful forces of a very different nature, forces which, just because they are so real, the school is often afraid to touch. Here, if anywhere, is the Achilles heel of so much of our education today: it is apt to be afraid of its own world.—*Fred Clarke.*

The teacher will have to teach dangerously. He will have to handle controversial issues.—*G. T. Hankin.*

Let me suggest what is distinctive in English education. . . . They instruct and they educate, having a double technique for a boy, as a pupil and as a person. Teach him the one way and you help him to get on and to live. Teach him the other, and you make him good to live with. Make a scholar or a scientist or an artist of him, if you can. But make a citizen of him you must.—*John Murray.*

Democracy's goal is . . . to keep human beings intelligently alert enough to feel that old responsibility for their own lives, even in the labyrinth maze of industrial society. The only chance for becoming truly adult in character in our complex modern world is by having brains well trained enough to see through surface complexities to the same old life-realities which always have been, always will be, the only foundations on which to build health, strength and the enjoyment of living. Hence democracy's impassioned attention to education.—*Dorothy Canfield Fisher.*

Charity and tolerance belong to the relations of men to one another; they do not belong in the realm of ideas and principles. When tolerance enters the realm of ideas it becomes indifference; and when indifference dominates the minds of men, human institutions, democracy included, are as weak and unstable in their foundations as the minds of men are clouded in their convictions.—*Anton C. Pegis.*

I prophesy that, once the principle of lifelong learning is accepted by the professional educators, debate among them on the content of education at various levels will recede in importance. The question will cease to be so much *what* shall we teach, but how *well* can we teach?—*Morse A. Cartwright.*

Human development and progress must be judged by standards of humanity as a whole.—*Ernest Bevin.*

If we can implant in our people the Christian virtues that we sum up in the word character, and, at the same time, give them a knowledge of the line which should be drawn between voluntary action and governmental compulsion in a democracy, and of what

can be accomplished within the stern laws of economics, we will enable them to retain their freedom, and at the same time, make them worthy to be free.—*Winthrop W. Aldrich.*

College Management¹

A Problem in Apportioning Control

By William H. Kilpatrick

How should the control of a college be apportioned among trustees, staff, and students? The editor in asking this question has set no easy problem. Even so, we shall have to complicate matters further by including the college president among those who are to share control. Some impetuous soul might wish to go still further and include also the public, and there is something to be said in favor, but we shall here say no and leave the public out of formal account.

To simplify matters if we can, let us agree to limit the discussion to this country, and generally to sacrifice scope for feasibility. For we seek a solution that may have a reasonable chance of acceptance, at least by some more forward-looking colleges. We may further agree that while we shall go as far as we can to give all affected by a decision a chance to share in making it, even with democracy we shall seek no doctrinaire application.

Let us then begin by asking as to the present state of affairs, what respective shares in control do the several parties now exercise? As regards ultimate legal control the answer is easy. The American practice is for the state to grant a charter which thereafter fixes final control in a board of trustees. Whatever rights or privileges the president or staff or students may exercise, these so far as the ordinary charter goes are exercised by grace of the trustees. For state institutions there may be variations from this simple rule, but even here the board of control (under whatever name) legally decides by its grace whatever, if any, rights or privileges staff or students shall enjoy.

Further as regards the present usual practice, the board of trustees, having chosen a president, put great power in his hands as

¹ Reprinted from *Journal of American Association of University Women*, Vol. 32, No. 1, October, 1938.

to recommending policies, nominating faculty members for election and promotion, drafting the budget, and the general management of affairs. In particular, by a recognized courtesy if not by positive enactment the president becomes the sole avenue through which communications of any sort may properly be directed to the board.

A correlative tradition to increase if possible the great powers actually wielded by the president is the urgent expectation that all members of the institution, especially all faculty members and subordinate officials, shall give "loyal" support to the president's policies. So great is the expectation that the president shall initiate policies and so great is the demand that all concerned shall cooperate to support these policies that, short of "flagrant immorality," no college sin is quite so heinous as "disloyalty" to the president and his policies.

It should be at once said in this connection that many presidents, probably the large majority, confer in considerable degree with staff members, possibly in open faculty meetings (formal or informal), before personally deciding upon any new policy. Moreover, stated by-laws as a rule give to faculties control over certain matters, as the making of curricula, recommendations as to degrees in course, disciplinary regulations, and the like. Many, perhaps most, presidential policies are thus formed only after prior consultation with the staff or with staff representatives.

But the degree of such consultation and with which (if any) staff members, these are matters that depend largely on the wishes of the president. He may consult and then make up his mind as he sees fit, the consultation having availed little or much as he shall decide. Moreover, as president he is answerable to the trustees, not to the faculty, and this fact is likely to assert itself in many, many significant ways. In paring the budget proposals, for example, he will probably say in staff meeting, "I am sorry that I could not grant all the requests. I have done the best I could; but the responsibility is mine and I have to carry it." In the trustees' meeting, he will say, "We have done the best we could, considering that we could not grant all requests. I trust that it will meet your approval."

As for the students, they have no original rights except such as

are guaranteed by the state and its laws. The rights and privileges they exercise derive largely from the staff under presidential advice as control over such matters has previously been granted by the trustees.

In the case of both staff and students the actual privileges exercised are much influenced by unwritten tradition. While tradition here as elsewhere does change, it changes but slowly. Freedom of teaching, for example, has thus grown to be a tradition, at least among the better institutions. To be sure, many new trustees, many alumni, and many "patriotic" groups would like to silence or dismiss a professor who speaks publicly against their sacred cows, but the tradition of freedom is deeply cherished by professors—and by better thinkers generally—and any threat of limitation will arouse quick and vigorous protest. Similarly, to mention more questionable matters, tradition supports gate-receipt athletics and fraternity houses. Many college authorities would like to curb or abolish one or both of these, but tradition—supported vigorously by alumni—is as yet too strong.

If this is a picture of what is, what now shall we say ought to be? Let us begin with the trustees. This type of control as described above is almost if not quite unique to this country. It probably arose out of frontier conditions. Harvard College having been agreed upon in law was to be established in fact. We can not with certainty say what kind of control was contemplated, rather possibly one modeled after the Oxford and Cambridge college, with control by president and fellows (fellows meaning resident instructors). But a commission of important citizens was appointed to organize and institute the new college, that is, choose a president and erect a building. Then during a long formative period the president refused to live at Cambridge. So external lay control over the new institution actually grew up as an established fact.

As other institutions were founded in the colonies and during the early national period the need to start them from nothing and the further need of the supporting groups to nurse them along made it easy to follow the Harvard custom of a lay group in external control. Even in our own day the need for institutional enlargement has if anything strengthened the place of trustees as the

source of needed money. Hence any questioning of the need for trustees has found small welcome.

As we ask, then, regarding the part trustees should have in control, it is no proposition to abolish them that we are considering. We may as well admit that, as far into the future as we can see, the board of trustees is here to stay. It is, however, a fair and needed question to ask what functions the board may properly exercise and what were better given up, and how a change may best be made from what is to what ought to be.

First, trustees may very properly have charge of raising and investing funds, but this kind of control of funds should not mean control of budget apportionment or of educational policies. Second, trustees may very well help in choosing the president, say on a fifty-fifty basis with the faculty. The reasons for each of these fifties are definite and strong. Third, if some feasible way can be found for effecting it, the trustees may help to keep the educational program from getting out of touch with the times. Beyond these services, this writer does not now see that trustees should properly go, except that they may well serve as useful friends when needed, certainly to help in raising funds, possibly in other matters.

Specifically, it seems necessary to give up the present idea that the trustees in any sense constitute the college. This idea, though hitherto prevailing in American legal fact, seems fundamentally at variance with any proper functional conception. Those who essentially carry on the work of the college are professionals in this field and should primarily constitute the college. This does not mean that these may ignore all others concerned, but it does mean that they should be the chief agency for making and executing policies (though, to be sure, the actual execution of policies will probably go on mainly through appointive officers).

It must be admitted that the question of educational control of the college is not simple. The study of higher education in any connected and developing sense is but new. Great leaders in college administration the past has to show, yes, but their labors were separate in time and place. No one has organized the results into a defined body of theory and practice to be studied and criticized and enlarged and corrected by further efforts. Only recently have we begun to do this.

Most college professors have never studied the problem of college management in any systematic way. Many lines of subject matter specialization are such as not to lead one to think much about the larger problems of what a college should try to be and do. Many professors, who have not thought much about this larger problem, as they grow old are unwilling to hear new proposals. There is real danger that a particular college faculty may grow academic in the bad sense, worship tradition and resist needed innovation. For this reason it seems safer to allow outside influence a chance to get inside and help determine policies. Presidents elected by lay boards have often done just this wholesome thing.

But lay boards tend to be business men, chosen for their monied connections. To them the college may be looked upon as a business enterprise, with themselves the directors and the president the executive in charge under them. On this view professors are the hired employees to carry out the policies determined upon by the directors on the advice of the president. The staff then are answerable to the president as he in turn is answerable to the trustees. The freshmen students are the raw material, the graduates as they go out are the manufactured product.

This business organization "line and staff" view of college administration is about as wrong as anything could well be. But, on the other hand, college professors, as was pointed out just above, may not of themselves always be adequate to the making of policies. Moreover, as already admitted, we now have the trustees and shall have them for years to come if not forever.

The proposal then, as the key to a new arrangement, is to have the president chosen jointly on equal terms by trustees and faculty, say nominated by a committee of three trustees and three professors and elected by the board and the faculty voting separately. Let there be further given to either body the right to say when it thinks a change in presidency is wise. Similarly, give to the two bodies the determination of any major change in institutional policy, while leaving to the faculty all other educational questions.

As to students, the problem is different. While the alumni may properly have representation on the Board of Trustees, the students should have opportunity to share in the consideration of

educational policies along with the faculty. In matters pertaining to student conduct they should have fuller power. As to curriculum and courses there should be a continuing student committee (chosen by the students) charged with the duty of keeping in touch with student opinion and judgment and meeting regularly with a faculty committee on educational policies. Just what degree of participation to give this committee may be debated. It might be well to have a joint faculty-student educational policies committee to consider and recommend all changes, with a subcommittee of this (including student representation) to present the recommendations to the faculty.

In matters of student conduct, it seems better to have responsibility largely in student hands, probably with a faculty representative to meet regularly with the student organization. But better student conduct and better character education will follow student responsibility, even though final authority may remain with the faculty.

The aim in these several proposals has been partly practical, partly educational. The practical aim is to get better decisions made. Accordingly, in these suggestions the effort has been to make provision for any and all pertinent thinking to share in the determination of policies. The educational aim is to up-build all concerned by giving thought a chance to show itself in responsible action. In the degree that this can be done, thought directs action, and action tests and corrects thought. In this way both thought and act should be improved and the effective connection between them strengthened. In it all, the effort has been to effect the desired aims with a minimum of change from what now obtains, this to increase the probability that the changes will be made.

REVIEWS

Preparation of School Personnel: Report of the Regents' Inquiry into the Character and Cost of Public Education in the State of New York, by Charles H. Judd, Chairman. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1938. Pp. xi + 151. \$1.50.

Meaning and purpose are not inherent in the facts of a survey; such values come more directly from the predilections, biases, and other elements that make up the social and educational philosophy of the surveyors. The tone and framework of this study may be indicated, in terms of the foregoing generalization, by saying that the underlying philosophy of teacher-education of the survey Committee is that of the liberal arts and private college. More specifically, the theory of teacher-education that dominates each interpretation and recommendation is that of Dr. Charles Hubbard Judd. In the proportion that a reader accepts or rejects the Judd philosophy of teacher-preparation will he accept or reject the findings of this volume of the Regents' Inquiry.

The liberal arts and private college leanings of the Committee show in each chapter of the Report. It is proposed that three or more of the state normal schools be closed, if possible, and their teacher-preparation functions be left to private colleges in the area; if the Legislature will not close them it is proposed that they undertake indicated types of vocational training of less than college grade. A further proposal in the same direction is that the State Education Department delegate part of the work of supervising secondary education to private colleges, especially to those outside New York City and particularly to the University of Buffalo, St. Lawrence, Cornell, and Syracuse Universities. The idea that private colleges shall supervise the public secondary schools of their geographical area is, to put it mildly, at great variance with the American tradition of public control accompanying support by taxation.

In the section on supervisory and administrative personnel,

it is lamented that most such officials were trained in graduate schools of education (especially in New York City) rather than in the upstate liberal arts colleges and universities. Certainly the state normal schools can not prepare them since they have had only a three-year curriculum. The liberal arts college attitude is stated in as partisan a way with regard to the training of the faculties of the state normal schools and teachers colleges: "How can the faculties of the New York State public teacher-preparing institutions be made more like the faculties of standard institutions of post-secondary grade?" The obvious answer is to give them more training in liberal arts institutions. That this is the intended answer is demonstrated by the criticism of the degrees held by teachers in the state normal schools: "The degrees are in strikingly large numbers Master's degrees from Teachers College, Columbia University. The degrees received from other institutions were in many cases secured through departments or schools of education." Aside from the gratuitous disparagement of Columbia (possibly a hangover from Judd's feud with Teachers College in the days when he directed similar work at the University of Chicago), the implication of the quotation is clearly that such degrees for college teachers are inferior.

The Report's opposition to a policy of close coordination of theory and practice in teacher-preparation, especially as this applies to observation and practice teaching, is a further reflection of the liberal arts college viewpoint. The study declares:

The great emphasis on direct contact with the pupils which is insisted upon by the State Education Department must be thought of as open to pointed criticism on the ground that fruitful observation of human behavior or of classroom procedures requires intellectual maturity and a background of scientific training lacking in the students whom the members of the Inquiry Staff found in many of the teacher-preparing institutions which they visited.

To this reviewer the above judgment seems about as realistic and valid as that of the parents who insist on picking the husband or wife of their child on the ground that the youth doesn't have enough of the several maturities essential to a wise choice. Medi-

cine, dentistry, law, and the other professions would admit the immaturity of their neophytes but because of this they would not separate theory and practice. The remedy lies in other courses of action. This reviewer can not cite a single study on the relative value of professional courses in education, as measured by the judgment of teachers, that does not give a very high ranking to observation and practice teaching. Dr. Judd and his Committee admit that the liberal arts colleges are having difficulty meeting the one hundred and twenty clock-hour requirements in observation and practice teaching; perhaps it is not putting it too strongly to say that the position of the Committee is in part a rationalization necessary to maintaining the alleged supremacy of the liberal arts college.

The statements to this point in the review, and the fact that the reviewer is a professor of education, imply that I am as biased towards professional schools of education and "professionalized courses" as the survey Committee is biased in favor of the liberal arts college. On the contrary, I champion the idea of prolonging general non-professional courses and delaying the introduction of professional courses until the junior and senior year and into the fifth year that is coming to be required of secondary teachers in New York State. I agree with such constructive proposals of the Report as the creation of a state council on teacher-preparation to take the place of State Education Department domination, that dormitories be provided, that the quality and quantity of teaching and administrative personnel be increased, that the curriculum for elementary teachers be raised to four years, that better social and recreation facilities be provided, and especially that financial support *must* be increased.

Despite its prejudices and partisanship, the Report is calculated to improve both the quality and quantity of state-supported teacher-preparation for elementary school teachers. It as surely leaves the preparation of secondary school teachers to the private liberal arts colleges of New York State.

The City College (New York)

ERNEST V. HOLLIS

Doctor's Oral, by George R. Stewart. New York: Random House, 1939. Pp. 259. \$2.00.

Few novelists have the courage to look for dramatic conflict in a routine academic exercise. Professor Stewart, author of such unacademic books as *Ordeal by Hunger* and *East of the Giants*, now draws on the University life he knows so well, and weaves a full length novel about the oral examination for the Ph.D. degree. The story might have been titled *Ordeal by Question* or *The Seven Against Joe*. For it resolves itself into a duel of wits. Joe Grantland, the candidate, sits at a table with seven inquisitors who hammer at his brains. Will he pass or will he fail? The peripetias are subtly and shrewdly managed, and the outcome is in doubt till the last minute.

Joe Grantland is a plugger, a country boy who went through college the hard way. For the story's sake, he could not be a brilliant scholar; there would have been no suspense. Nor, obviously, would a dullard answer the purpose. He must be a borderline case, such as every professor prays to be delivered from. Joe has been diligently coached by one of the dilettante perennials who hang about graduate schools. His committee has been scanned for weaknesses and tricks of mind as a trial lawyer combs the jury on a murder case. Stewart has portrayed his faculty people with care and insight: Brice, the aspiring administrator; Martiness, the show-off idolized by his students and secretly scorned by his colleagues; Angle, the big man above bickerings; Fanny Holtby, impartial, mellowed by a youthful romance; Kendrick, the glowering sluggard; and other lesser campus lights. All of them mean to be fair, but personalities inevitably interfere. Behind these figures, there is a backdrop of campus atmosphere, done with the skill of an expert observer.

With such a theme, it would have been easy for the novelist to dip his pen in corrosive. Stewart has refrained. The locale is carefully stylized: you will not be able to spot the campus if he can prevent it. Here are no portraits of well-known faculty faces: he has been at some pains to disguise them. These professors are not caricatures, they are human beings, suffering a trifle from occupational desiccation, but subject to the same impulses of meanness and generosity, vanity and conscientious-

ness, that stir the average person. With suave irony Stewart casts light and shade upon the characters, and lets them speak for themselves.

As to life among graduate students, it comes out as mere ambitious scholasticism, warmed and colored by sex and beer. What is totally absent from these young men and women is zest for research, the spirit of discovery. The scene, to be sure, is a Department of English, and possibly Professor Stewart, who can not have failed to consider the matter, wishes us to think that in the twentieth century we must turn to the natural sciences to find anything like a humanistic enthusiasm for learning. In his picture there is little except job-seekers who need some letters after their names. Of such there are plenty in every college, but they are not the whole story; not even now, when nine out of ten graduate students are scraping along on a pittance. Granted that the irresistible urge toward exploration is rare even in graduate schools, where it ought to be rife; still it does exist, and no picture of University life is complete unless it gives a glimpse of the true scholar to whom hours of work, degrees, rewards, are nothing compared with the finding of a new fact or principle.

This is not a big novel like *East of the Giants*. But it has its touch of bigness by implication. For Stewart knows, as he always has known, how often chance tips the scales. Whether on the emigrant trail, on a California ranch, or in an examination room, the moment comes when a hair's weight means success or disaster. If Professor Angle decides to take a strong line and exert his authority, Joe will pass, get his job, marry his girl, save her reputation, and move on to happiness ever after. If Angle holds his tongue, all the opposite things will happen. Stewart is a master of suspense, and the reader will find it hard to guess which way the fatal cat will jump.

Technically, the book contains one flaw. If Joe, a borderline case, failed by a narrow margin to pass, he would not be hopelessly lost. Beyond doubt, he would be given a second try, after a lapse of time during which he could restuff his cranium. By reason of such mercifulness a University is called a Fostering Mother. But Joe needed his job at once, so this is hardly a flaw.

Doctor's Oral is required reading for graduate students and

University professors. They will see themselves as through a lens, enlarged and slightly distorted. For the general public, despite the cloistered setting, it should be as fascinating as a fencing match with real swords.

University of California

S. G. MORLEY

A Short History of Political Thinking, by Paul W. Ward. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. 127. \$1.50.

No sensitive observer of events can fail to note the spread of political thinking into every walk of life. This would not in itself be remarkable were it not the accompaniment of an emerging dichotomy of political structure which may, indeed, tear the world apart. It is not only in international affairs that the conflicting ideologies of autocracy and democracy are exhibiting basic incompatibilities. Also in the theory and structure of industry, of educational institutions, of churches, of the family, of welfare agencies, and most of all of government, these opposing modes of group organization are becoming increasingly self-conscious and distinct. The dominance of the one can be achieved only by war; the dominance of the other, only by education.

Professor Ward may not have been conscious of using this age-old conflict as an organizing principle of his brief account of political thinking. If so, the more apparent does it become that this issue has been the focus of political changes from the beginning. Here is a natural dynamic affording an explanation not only of successive political structures and philosophies but also of the evolution of each opposing form as it learns through conflict its own weaknesses and strength. Thus autocracy outgrows the ethical considerations which once hampered its ruthlessness, and democracy sharpens its tools of discussion and group action and offers as the alternative to force the capacity of education to equip for self-direction the free individual.

So urgent are the contemporary problems in all walks of life that emerge from the conflict that Professor Ward's clear and forceful narrative of its main historical antecedents is of peculiar timeliness.

He begins, of course, with the shifting fortunes and philosophies of the Greek city-state, moving on in historical sequence through the Roman empire, the Roman church, the rise of absolute monarchy and the conception of sovereignty, the trial balloons of democratic theory and the political experiment of democracy, the emergence of the nation-state, and finally, the contemporary conflict of ideologies. In the development of this pageant of thinkers, each is allowed to speak for himself and for his own time and circumstance.

The mention of this book in the *Bulletin* is amply justified by the fact that college and university administration is today confused and uncertain on precisely the issues with which it deals. The historic consequences of the successive swings toward autocracy, so well depicted by the author, might well be pondered by faculties and administrators.

Yale University

HUGH HARTSHORNE

Publications Received

Court over Constitution, A Study of Judicial Review as an Instrument of Popular Government, by Edward S. Corwin. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1938. Pp. 273. \$2.50.

The Dynamics of Higher Education, by Walter A. Lunden. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Printing Company, 1939. Pp. 402. \$4.25.

Economics for Consumers, by Leland J. Gordon. New York: American Book Company, 1939. Pp. 638. \$3.00.

Equal Educational Opportunity for Youth, by Newton Edwards. A Report to the American Youth Commission. Washington: American Council on Education, 1939. Pp. 189. \$2.00.

The Failing Student, by Kenneth L. Heaton and Vivian Weedon. A Study of Academic Failure and the Implication for Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939. Pp. 286. \$2.50.

Federal Activities in Education, by the Educational Policies Commission. Washington: National Education Association, 1939. Pp. 151. 50 cents.

Freedom of Inquiry and Expression, edited by Edward P. Cheyney. Philadelphia: The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 200, November, 1938. Pp. 365. \$2.50.

The Government of Education in Metropolitan Chicago, by John Albert Vieg. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939. Pp. 274. \$2.50.

Guide for the Description and Evaluation of Research Materials, edited by Robert B. Downs. Chicago: American Library Association, 1939. Pp. 49.

The Health of College Students, by Harold S. Diehl and Charles E. Shepard. A Report to the American Youth Commission. Washington: American Council on Education, 1939. Pp. 169. \$1.50 clothbound.

Historical Scholarship in the United States, 1876-1901: as Revealed in the Correspondence of Herbert B. Adams. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1938. Pp. 314. \$2.50.

A History of the Position of Dean of Women in a Selected Group of Co-Educational Colleges and Universities in the United States, by Lulu Holmes. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University. Pp. 141. \$1.60.

Index Generalis, The Yearbook of Universities. Edited by S. de Montessus de Ballore. Paris: Masson & Company, 1939. Agent for United States: F. S. Crofts and Company, 41 Union Square, West, New York City. Pp. 2830. \$12.50.

Knowledge for What? The Place of Social Science in American Culture, by Robert S. Lynd. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1939. Pp. 268. \$2.50.

The Library of Tomorrow, A Symposium, edited by Emily M. Danton. Chicago: American Library Association, 1939. Pp. 191. \$2.50.

The Meaning of the Humanities, edited by Theodore Meyer Greene. Five essays by Ralph Barton Perry, August Charles Krey, Erwin Panofsky, Robert Lowry Calhoun, and Gilbert Chinard. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1938. Pp. 178. \$2.50.

Mediaeval Pageant, by John R. Reinhard. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1939. Pp. 660. \$4.00.

A Planned Supply of Teachers for Vermont, by Francis Louis Bailey. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1939. Pp. 88. \$1.60.

Public Opinion in a Democracy, by Charles W. Smith, Jr. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1939. Pp. 598. \$4.00 (educational: \$3.00).

Reference Books of 1935-1937, An Informal Supplement to Guide to Reference Books, by Isadore G. Mudge. Chicago: American Library Association, 1939. Pp. 69. 90 cents.

Research and Statistical Methodology, Books and Reviews, 1933-1938, edited by Oscar Krisen Buros. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1938. Pp. 100. \$1.25.

The Seventh Yearbook of School Law, edited by M. M. Chambers. Washington: American Council on Education, 1939. Pp. 199. \$1.00.

Some Problems of Personnel in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Report by a special committee appointed by the President of Harvard University. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939. Pp. 165.

Toward a Dimensional Realism, by Charles M. Perry. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1939. Pp. 180. \$2.50.

COUNCIL RECORD

Sessions April 21-22, 1939

The spring meeting of the Council was held in Washington, D. C., at the Women's City Club, 736 Jackson Place, N. W., on Friday, April 21, and Saturday, April 22. On April 21 the meeting was in session from 2:00-6:15 P. M. and on April 22 from 9:15 A. M.-12:45 P. M. and from 2:00-5:00 P. M. The following Council members were in attendance at one or more of the sessions: President Ingraham, Vice-President Krey, Treasurer Lewis, General Secretary Himstead, and Professors Boas, Bullitt, Cady, Carlson, Cole, Cook, Doggett, Dow, Foster, Gray, Hale, Hepburn, Hill, Holcombe, Hook, Langley, Lund, Mathews, Robinson, Schenck, Scott, S. S. Smith, Stonequist, Swartz, Torrey, Vance, and Warne.

I. Academic Freedom and Tenure

Proposed List of Commended Administrations. A proposal by Professor Vance, that there be published regularly in the *Bulletin* a list of institutions whose administrations have specifically indicated their approval of and adherence to the principles of academic freedom and tenure endorsed by the American Association of University Professors and other educational associations as set forth in the 1925 conference statement and in the 1938 statement, was considered. In the discussion of this proposal, it was pointed out that a questionnaire study of tenure made several years ago showed that, while most college and university presidents stated their approval of these principles and general adherence to them, at relatively few institutions had they been officially endorsed or adopted by boards of trustees. It was also pointed out that at many publicly controlled institutions there were constitutional and legal provisions for the annual appointment of all teachers which at present stood in the way of definite legal adoption of academic tenure. It was emphasized that the Association's experience in

investigating many dismissals indicated that at some institutions there was great disparity between what administrative officers said about academic freedom and tenure and what they did; and that with reference to academic freedom and tenure there was, in fact, observance of good academic practice at certain institutions whether privately or publicly controlled where such observance was least expected. Because of these several factors and imponderables indicated, it was the sense of the meeting that it would be impracticable at this time to publish a list of commended administrations.

Preventive Work. Professor Vance raised the question as to the nature of the preventive work now being done by the Association to forestall tenure violations and suggested the desirability of informing members of boards of trustees of the nature and purposes of the Association and of the approved principles of academic freedom and tenure. In reply to his question and in the discussion of his suggestion, it was pointed out that at present the Association seeks to minimize tenure difficulties by encouraging the development of the professional concept among college and university teachers, by cooperation with the Association of American Colleges, by the dissemination of information concerning the nature and purposes of the Association and its several professional objectives and principles, through chapter meetings to which non-members are invited, through correspondence with non-members whose names were suggested for membership, through chapter *Bulletin* subscriptions for college and university administrative officers and trustees (now available at the special reduced rate of fifty cents a year), and by personal letters to all newly elected college and university presidents. The General Secretary reported that these letters to college presidents were almost always cordially acknowledged and apparently gratefully received and that frequently they led to requests for more specific information and to conferences in the Washington office. The General Secretary also explained that with reference to chapter *Bulletin* subscriptions for trustees and administrative officers personal letters were written to the recipients informing them that the *Bulletin* was being sent through the courtesy of the chapter. The letters include a brief statement about the nature and purposes of the Asso-

ciation and with each there is enclosed a circular of information. He reported that such letters were almost always cordially acknowledged. It was the consensus of the Council that the present efforts to acquaint administrative officers and trustees with the principles of good academic practice, and thus prevent possible tenure violations and encourage equitable faculty-administration relations, were at present as adequate as could be expected. The hope was expressed that more chapters would avail themselves of the special *Bulletin* subscription for trustees and administrative officers.

Voluntary Information Service Concerning Academic Freedom and Tenure. Professor Smith suggested the desirability of having certain members in every chapter or local group assume the responsibility for reporting to the members of Committees A or E, or to the Council, any impending violations of or threats to academic freedom or tenure, so that the national officers could intervene in advance of an actual dismissal. This suggestion was discussed at length and, in so far as it sought to increase the vigilance of the profession, was approved. It was pointed out, however, that if certain individuals volunteered their services as official informers for the Association, and that fact became known, at some institutions unpleasant consequences might result for reasons that are quite obvious. In this connection, it was also pointed out that the national officers at present regularly receive information concerning conditions of academic freedom and tenure from many sources and that the members of the profession should be encouraged to bring such information to the attention of the responsible officers. Concerning actual intervention in a tenure situation, however, it was stressed that experience indicates that it is unwise for the Association to intervene unless requested to do so by the teacher whose tenure is in jeopardy or with his specific permission.

Proposal that Association Concern Itself with Academic Freedom and Tenure for Teachers in Secondary Schools. A proposal that the activities of Committee A be extended to investigate certain carefully selected cases of alleged violations of freedom and tenure in secondary schools was suggested in the preliminary report of Committee Q on Preparation and Qualification of Teachers presented to the Annual Meeting and considered by the Council in De-

ember, 1938. At the time the Council voted to refer the proposal to Committee A for study with instructions to bring in a report at the spring meeting of the Council. In the absence of the Chairman of Committee A, the General Secretary reported that the consensus of the Committee was that, in view of its already crowded docket and limited resources, it did not seem advisable to assume additional responsibilities, but that no definite conclusion had been reached. The Chairman of Committee A and the General Secretary, in a memorandum presented by the latter, suggested the possibility of encouraging an affiliate professional association for secondary school teachers similar in character to the American Association of University Professors, one of whose purposes would be to deal with problems of freedom and tenure.

The General Secretary reported that he had received letters and communications from several secondary school teachers and professors of education, expressing the hope that the American Association of University Professors would concern itself with freedom and tenure in the secondary schools. The Council *voted* to refer the proposal also to Committee B on Freedom of Speech for consideration with instructions to report to the Council at its next meeting.

Action of Association of American Colleges on 1938 Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure. Professor Swartz requested information as to what action had been taken by the Association of American Colleges on the joint statement of principles of academic freedom and tenure agreed upon by representatives of that Association and of the American Association of University Professors and endorsed at the 1938 Annual Meeting. In reply to this question the General Secretary presented information concerning official action by the Association of American Colleges as set forth in the following excerpts from the minutes of the twenty-fifth annual meeting held in Louisville, Kentucky, January 12 and 13, 1939, as published in the March, 1939, Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges, pages 144-145:

President Henry M. Wriston, of Brown University, Chairman of the Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure, made the majority report of that Commission. He explained with

clarity and eloquence the reasons for endorsing the majority report (see pages 110-123).

President William C. Dennis, of Earlham College, made the minority report with an urgent plea that certain changes be made before the endorsement of the report by the Association.

After the formal motion had been made by President Wriston to endorse the report as it is found on page 110, copies of which had been put in the hands of all present, President Clarence P. McClelland, of MacMurray College, moved to amend the report by striking out the sentence, "The judgment of what constitutes fulfillment of these obligations should rest with the individual." This sentence is the last sentence in the paragraph under the caption ACADEMIC FREEDOM in the statement drawn up by the joint action of the Association's commission and a similar commission from the American Association of University Professors.

After considerable debate participated in by Elam J. Anderson, University of Redlands; Winslow S. Anderson, Rollins College; Herbert J. Burgstahler, Cornell College; Gordon K. Chalmers, Kenyon College; W. C. Dennis, Earlham College; E. J. Jaqua, Scripps College; Thomas E. Jones, Fisk University; W. G. Leutner, Western Reserve University; Irwin J. Lubbers, Central College (Iowa); Daniel L. Marsh, Boston University; Irving Maurer, Beloit College; Gilbert W. Mead, Washington College; Philip C. Nash, University of Toledo; Laurens H. Seelye, St. Lawrence University; William P. Tolley, Allegheny College; Clyde E. Wildman, DePauw University; H. M. Wriston, Brown University; and several others, Chairman Seaton put the motion to amend, which was carried. The following motion was made by President Herbert J. Burgstahler, of Cornell College: "I should like to move as a substitute that action be postponed for one year on all that is before us as amended," explaining later that he meant the motion to carry everything into postponement so that next year the matter would come up *de novo*. This motion prevailed.

It was explained that the above action of the Association of American Colleges should not be construed as any lessening of the interest in good academic practice with reference to freedom and tenure which was evidenced by that Association's specific endorsement in 1925 of the conference statement and its reaffirmation of the statement in 1935.

Possible Agreements on Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure with Organizations Other Than the Association of American Colleges. Professor Swartz raised the question of the possibility

and urged the desirability of cooperation with organizations other than the Association of American Colleges in seeking agreements on the principles set forth in the 1938 statement. He referred particularly to the American Association of Teachers Colleges as an organization whose cooperation should be sought, pointing out that teachers colleges were not eligible for membership in the Association of American Colleges. It was the consensus of the meeting that other educational organizations, particularly those whose representatives agreed to the 1925 conference statement, should be approached with the view to securing further cooperation at such time as in the opinion of the responsible officers it seemed advisable. In this connection, it was pointed out that the 1925 conference statement still prevailed and had lost none of its validity as a document evidencing good academic custom and usage and that the 1938 statement sought primarily to clarify this academic custom and usage as it had evolved since 1925.

Possible Over-Emphasis of Academic Freedom and Tenure. The General Secretary presented two letters from members of the Association setting forth the criticism that undue emphasis was being placed on academic freedom and tenure in the present work and administration of the Association. One member of the Council indicated that he thought this criticism should be given careful consideration; that there was danger of over-emphasis not only on academic freedom and tenure, but also on the discussion of faculty participation in college and university government.

It was the sense of the meeting that in the light of the evidence of conditions affecting academic freedom and tenure at many colleges and universities too much emphasis was not being given to this part of the Association's work.

Concerning the Legal Advisership for Committee A. A proposal with reference to the legal advisership for Committee A, submitted by a former Council member for the consideration of the Council, was presented by the General Secretary. No action was taken.

II. Policies and Procedures

Advisability of Extending Eligibility for Membership to Include Faculties of Independent Junior Colleges. A proposal to make

eligible for membership in the Association teachers on the faculties of independent junior colleges was on the agenda of business considered by the Council at the December, 1938, meeting. The Council at that time voted to refer this proposal to Committee O on Organization and Policy for study and for the possible drafting of an enabling constitutional amendment to be presented for consideration by the next Annual Meeting. Professor Cook, the Chairman of Committee O, requested an expression of opinion from the Council, and the proposal was again considered. Following an extended discussion, it was *voted* that it was the sense of the Council that the Constitution be amended to provide that teachers on the faculties of independent junior colleges be eligible for membership in the Association.

Advertising Vacancies in Teaching Positions. The subject of the desirability of advertising vacancies in teaching positions, especially those in the higher ranks, was discussed by the Council at its December, 1938, meeting and by the 1938 Annual Meeting. The subject was referred by the latter body to the Council for further study with instructions to present recommendations to the 1939 Annual Meeting.

The Council *voted* its approval of the practice of advertising teaching vacancies and instructed the President to appoint a committee of three to formulate a resolution concerning the desirability of the proposed practice, this resolution to be published in one of the fall issues of the *Bulletin*. The hope was expressed that the publication of such a resolution with an explanatory statement by the committee would bring the subject to the attention of the membership and prepare them for its consideration at the 1939 Annual Meeting. President Ingraham appointed to this special committee Professors Foster, Boas, and Hook. Professor Foster was named the chairman.

Proposals to Add The American University of Cairo and the University of Santo Tomas to the Association's Eligible List. Proposals to add to the Association's list of eligible institutions The American University of Cairo and the University of Santo Tomas were considered. It was *voted* to add The American University of Cairo to the eligible list. Concerning the University of Santo Tomas, in the absence of certain information concerning the Board of Control,

it was *voted* that consideration be postponed until the next meeting.

Council Direction of Regional and Chapter Meetings. A suggestion that the Council seek to give more direction and assistance to chapters and local groups in the promotion and planning of regional and chapter meetings, submitted by Professor Benson, was in his absence presented by the General Secretary. In explanation of his suggestion in a letter to the General Secretary, Professor Benson urged more or less continuous communication between the Council and chapters concerning current issues, particularly those of a controversial nature. It was the consensus of the Council that the present practice of inviting chapters to submit matters for Council consideration through Chapter Letters and the regular publication of all Council Records in the *Bulletin* were now achieving many of the results desired by Professor Benson. The General Secretary explained that in addition to the publication of Council Records in the *Bulletin*, and the requests for suggestions from chapters, he also sought in Chapter Letters to direct special attention to specific matters pending before the Council and to business transacted by the Council which should be considered by chapters and local groups. The hope was expressed that these efforts to keep the membership informed of current business would stimulate chapters to consider in their meetings current professional and organizational problems.

Requested Endorsement of Manifesto on Freedom of Science. A manifesto signed by 1284 American scientists summoning their colleagues to participate actively in the defense of democracy as the sole means of preserving intellectual freedom and insuring scientific progress was submitted to the Council for consideration and endorsement at its December, 1938, meeting by the General Secretary at the request of Professor Franz Boas, of Columbia University. At that meeting no decision was reached, but further consideration of the proposal to endorse the manifesto was made an order of business for the spring meeting.

After a full discussion, it was *voted* that the General Secretary inform Professor Boas that it was the sense of the Council that a resolution adopted by the Association at its 1938 Annual Meeting (see February, 1939, *Bulletin*, page 6) expressed more accurately the viewpoint of the American Association of University Professors.

Rôle of Federal Government in Education. It was *voted* that the special committee authorized to study the activity of the federal government with reference to higher education report at the next meeting of the Council on the enlargement of the federal rôle in education, with special reference to education at the college level, and make recommendations as to any possible Association action that should be taken.

Usefulness of Association to Younger Teachers. Upon suggestion of Professor Gray, the Council discussed ways in which the Association can give maximum help to the younger members of the profession. In the discussion of this subject it was pointed out that every objective of the Association seeks to benefit every member of the profession, whatever his age. Special mention was made of the Association's efforts since its organization in 1915 to secure tenure protection for all teachers, including instructors, after probationary periods of reasonable length. It was pointed out that these efforts were to be continued.¹

The work of Committee T on Place and Function of Faculties in College and University Government, which is seeking to bring about better faculty-administration relations and the development of the partnership concept for the teacher-administration relation, was discussed. It was pointed out that the work of this Committee is of especial benefit to the younger members of the profession and is to be prosecuted as thoroughly and systematically as the work of Committee A.

It was *voted* that publicity be given to the place of the younger teacher in the Association and that the General Secretary or someone appointed by him who is familiar with the history of the Association gather data on this subject and prepare a statement for publication in the *Bulletin* and/or a Chapter Letter, setting forth the facts concerning the value of the Association to younger teachers.

Relations with Other Organizations. The report of a special committee to study possibilities of cooperating with the American

¹ For recent evidence of the Association's efforts in behalf of tenure for younger teachers, see 1938 statement on academic freedom and tenure, February, 1939, *Bulletin*, pp. 26-28.

Federation of Teachers was presented by Professor Ingraham. The committee recommended:

(1) That no report of the informal meeting of representatives of the Association and of the American Federation of Teachers held in February, 1938, be published;

(2) That no statement of comparative policies of the two organizations be published;

(3) That the scope of the committee's work be broadened to include the study of the Association's relations with all other organizations who may be interested in some of the same problems;

(4) That the present or another committee be empowered to draw up with the assistance of the General Secretary a statement for use in a Chapter Letter outlining the policies of the Association as regards relations of chapters with locals of the American Federation of Teachers and with other organizations, to be referred to the Council for approval before release to chapters and/or publication in the *Bulletin*.

(5) That the Council authorize at the discretion of the President and the General Secretary the expense of one committee meeting before the next regular meeting of the Council.

It was *voted* to adopt the report and continue the committee with its present personnel.

The Bulletin. Professor Warne presented several suggestions for improving the *Bulletin*, which were discussed and which in turn brought forth other suggestions concerning content, tone, and emphasis. No action was taken.

III. Committee Business

Committee T on Place and Function of Faculties in College and University Government. The General Secretary reported on steps that had been taken to secure a grant for the work of Committee T. President Ingraham announced that the officers would continue to try to find sources of revenue for studies undertaken by this committee.

Committee on Concession Service. Professor Warne urged that a report of the special Committee on Concession Service be requested for the next meeting of the Council.

Appointment of 1939 Nominating Committee. The following nominations for a panel of names from which the members of the 1939 Nominating Committee were to be selected were presented by President Ingraham, *voted* on by ballot, and approved: Professors William F. Edgerton, Egyptology, University of Chicago, Chairman; W. O. Sypherd, English, University of Delaware; J. Hobart Bushey, Mathematics, Hunter College; William Anderson, Political Science, University of Minnesota; Richard H. Shryock, History, University of Pennsylvania. At the same time, he presented the following names as alternates for the Nominating Committee, which were *voted* on by ballot and approved: Professors F. J. Tschan, History, The Pennsylvania State College; Kirk Porter, Political Science, The State University of Iowa; Loren C. Petry, Zoology, Cornell University; and John W. Bradshaw, Mathematics, University of Michigan.

Appointment of Executive Committee of the Council. The following nominations for membership on the Executive Committee of the Council presented by President Ingraham were *voted* on by ballot and approved: Professors James B. Bullitt, A. J. Carlson, William M. Hepburn, Victor Hill, A. N. Holcombe, Eunice Schenck, DR Scott.

IV. Financial Business

Report of the Treasurer. The Treasurer's report for the first three months of 1939 was presented by Professor Lewis and approved by the Council.

Revisions in 1939 Budget. Upon motion of Professor Lewis, it was *voted* that the budget figure for membership dues be raised from \$47,000 to \$50,000 and that the budget figure for advertising be lowered from \$250 to \$150.

Suggestions Concerning the Association's Finances. Professor Carlson, Chairman of the Finance Committee, submitted the following suggestions concerning the Association's finances:

- (1) Seek a grant from a foundation to pay the traveling expenses for some Association member of national reputation to visit every chapter, college, and university to present and explain the nature and purposes of the Association and its problems as a means of increasing membership;

- (2) Stagger membership dues on the basis of salary or rank;
- (3) Seek to obtain an annual contribution from some source as an endowment for the Association's work in behalf of academic freedom and freedom of speech.

As a suggestion rather than an instruction, the Council *voted* to authorize the officers of the Association to attempt to procure a grant to carry out Professor Carlson's first suggestion.

Additional Assistance in the Washington Office. The General Secretary presented a statement which he had previously sent to all the members of the Council with the agenda of business concerning the increasing volume of work in the Washington office, particularly that of Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure, recommending that either this professional service be limited or the personnel in the national office be increased. It was the consensus of the Council that the work of Committee A should not be curtailed. After full discussion of the situation, it was *voted* that the General Secretary be empowered to select a man, subject to the approval of the Council, to assist in the work of the Washington office at a salary not to exceed \$5000 a year (his title and duties to be determined by the General Secretary).

V. Miscellaneous Business

Possible Extension of Social Security Act to Include College and University Teachers. There was a general discussion of the possible extension of the Social Security Act to include college and university teachers. No action was taken.

Directory of Association Members. It was the sense of the meeting that a directory of Association members be published in the fall of 1940.

Place and Date of 1939 Annual Meeting. It was *voted* to hold the Association's 1939 Annual Meeting in New Orleans, Louisiana, in connection with the meeting of the Modern Language Association of America the last week in December, the dates to be determined by the officers.

National Headquarters. Data regarding the selection or construction of a building in Washington, D. C., to house the national headquarters of the Association prepared by a committee from the

Goucher College chapter were distributed to the members of the Council by Professor Lewis. Upon motion of Professor Lewis, the subject was referred to the Executive Committee of the Council and will be placed on the agenda for the next Council meeting.

Bulletin Subscriptions for Emeritus Members. At the suggestion of the General Secretary, the Council voted to regularize the practice of sending the *Bulletin* to Emeritus members at the special subscription price of \$1.00 per year.

Reduced Postal Rates on Books. The matter of the temporary reduction in postal rates on books accomplished by an executive order issued by President Roosevelt on November 1, 1938, reducing to 1½ cents per pound the rates on books regardless of zone for a trial period until June 30, 1939, was discussed.

It was *voted* to commend the action of the President and to express the hope that the Congress will enact legislation providing for the continuance of such reduced postal rates at the conclusion of the present trial period. At the request of the United States Office of Education this resolution was subsequently communicated to the President of the United States.¹

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD, *General Secretary*

¹ By subsequent Executive Order this reduction in postal rates on books is to be continued until June 30, 1941.

EDITORIAL

This is a plea for toleration of spirit within the brotherhood of American scholars.

In every period of world conflict feelings are deep. This should be so. But our emotions for one point of view or another should not blind us to the fact that those with whom we differ may be equally honest and equally clear-headed; nor should we forget that their feelings are also stirred. When differences of opinion really seem to matter, strains are inevitable. However, we must not allow ties of affection and mutual respect that have been wrought between us and our colleagues by years of ardent cooperation in the cause of scholarship to be broken at the first test of their strength.

These considerations are not devoid of relationship to the work of this Association. We have been devoted to the cause of academic freedom because through academic freedom alone can scholarship be both healthy and useful. We have frequently battled against instances of what seemed to us to be administrative intolerance. But the administrative tools are not the only weapons of oppression. One's colleagues can often in the department, in the club, in the church, throughout a hundred walks of life use more subtle, more torturing and no less effective means of curtailing freedom than can the administrator. One of the most frequent mistakes, but still one of the most natural mistakes, for a university or college executive to make is to decide that when personal tension between faculty members has reached a certain pitch, the dismissal of some of them is necessary for the good of the institution. Moreover, the men dismissed are more likely than not to be those taking the unpopular side of an argument. Even those of us who most strenuously maintain that such a cure is worse than the illness can not belittle the harm that may be done an institution by animosities within its staff. It is for us to minimize such difficulties. Our institutions still have scars that remind us that the duty to avoid bitterness is unusually urgent this year.

We may naturally hope that those who represent a minority point of view will heed the above considerations. Yet those of us who belong to the majority must realize that the duties of toleration lie even more heavily on our shoulders, remembering that members of the minority lack the constant ease of emotional outlet possessed by others. Proponents of a popular cause bear the responsibility of those who wield the power to hurt.

May American scholars show a devotion to the principles for which this Association has stood and now stands. Each should be free to the utmost to urge with warmth, but with respect for others, his own point of view. Let us be of the world but still maintain a haven for democratic processes and scholarly ideals.

MARK H. INGRAHAM, *President*

September 21, 1939

Censured Administrations

Investigations by this Association of the administrations of the several institutions listed below show that they are not maintaining conditions of academic freedom and tenure in accordance with academic custom and usage as formulated in the 1925 Washington Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure, and endorsed by this Association, by the Association of American Colleges, and by representatives of the American Association of University Women, the Association of American Universities, the Association of Governing Boards, the Association of Land Grant Colleges, the Association of Urban Universities, the National Association of State Universities, and the American Council on Education.

Placing the name of an institution on this list does not mean that censure is visited by this Association either upon the whole of that institution or upon the faculty, but specifically upon its present administration. This procedure does not affect the eligibility of non-members for membership in the Association, nor does it affect the individual rights of our members at the institution in question, nor do members of the Association who accept positions on the faculty of an institution whose administration is thus censured forfeit their membership. This list is published for the sole purpose of informing our members, the profession at large, and the public that unsatisfactory conditions of academic freedom and tenure have been found to prevail at these institutions. Names are placed on or removed from this censured list only by vote of the Association's Annual Meeting.

The censured administrations together with the dates of these actions by the Annual Meeting are listed below. Reports of investigations were published as indicated by the *Bulletin* citations:

Brenau College, Gainesville, Georgia	December, 1933
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh,	December, 1935
Pennsylvania (March, 1935, <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 224-266)	
State Board of Higher Education,	December, 1938
North Dakota (December, 1938, <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 585-597)	

MEMBERSHIP

Membership in the American Association of University Professors is open to *all* college and university teachers from the faculties of eligible institutions, *including graduate students, graduate assistants, and instructors*. The list of eligible institutions is based primarily on the accredited lists of the regional accrediting agencies subject to modification by action of the Association. Election to membership is by the Committee on Admissions following nomination by three present members of the Association who need not be on the faculty of the same institution as the nominee. Election can not take place until thirty days after the nomination is published in the *Bulletin*. Nomination forms, circulars of information, and other information concerning the Association may be procured by writing to the General Secretary, 744 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

The classes and conditions of membership in this Association as provided by the present Constitution, By-Laws, and regulations are as follows:

(a) *Active*. To become an Active member, it is necessary to hold, and to have held for two years, a position of teaching or research with the rank of instructor or higher in an eligible institution and be devoting at least half time to teaching or research. At the discretion of the Committee on Admissions service in foreign institutions may be counted toward the two-year requirement. Annual dues are \$4.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

(b) *Junior*. Junior membership is open to two classes: persons who are, or within the past five years have been, graduate students in eligible institutions, or persons now teaching in eligible institutions who are qualified for nomination as Active members except in length of service. Junior Members are transferred to Active membership as soon as they become eligible. Annual dues are \$3.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

(c) *Associate*. Associate members include those members who, ceasing to be eligible for Active or Junior membership because their work has become primarily administrative, are transferred

to the Associate list with the approval of the Council. Annual dues are \$3.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

(d) *Emeritus*. Any Active member retiring for age from a position in teaching or research may be transferred, at his own request and with the approval of the Council, to Emeritus membership, which allows exemption from dues, with receipt of the *Bulletin*, if desired, at \$1.00 per year.

(e) *Life Membership*. The Treasurer is authorized by the Council to receive applications from Active and Associate members for Life membership, the amount to be determined in each case on an actuarial basis. This includes a life subscription to the *Bulletin*.

Nominations for Membership

The following 172 nominations for Active membership and 22 nominations for Junior membership are printed as provided by the Constitution. In accordance with action by the Council, objections to any nominee may be addressed to the General Secretary, who will in turn transmit them for the consideration of the Committee on Admissions if received within thirty days after this publication. The Council of the Association has ruled that the primary purpose of this provision for protests is to bring to the attention of the committee any question concerning the technical eligibility of the nominee for membership as provided in the Constitution.

The Committee on Admissions consists of Professors Ella Lonn, Goucher College, *Chairman*; H. L. Crosby, University of Pennsylvania; B. W. Kunkel, Lafayette College; A. Richards, University of Oklahoma; W. O. Sypherd, University of Delaware; and F. J. Tschan, Pennsylvania State College.

Active

University of Alabama, Mardis O. Hulsey; Armour Institute of Technology, W. B. Fulghum, Jr., Walter Hendricks, Sanford Meech; Atlanta University, Rushton Coulborn; Baylor University, Ruby H. Briscoe; Boston University, Richard K. Conant; University of California (Los Angeles), Harrison M. Karr; Centenary College of Louisiana, William G. Banks, Robert E. Smith; Central Y. M. C. A. College, Laird T. Hites; University of Cincinnati, John L. Baker, Margaret Fulford, Howard K. Justice, Harold S. Nash, Ernest Pickering, Jessie M. Roberts, Harold W. Sibert; Coe College, Vernon E. Lichtenstein, C. Ward Macy, A. W. Meyer; Coker College, Charles A. Sisson; University

of Colorado, Edward F. D'Arms, Walter B. Franklin, Harold Hoffmeister, Horace Jones, Dorothy R. Martin; **Drury College**, Willard L. Graves; **Duquesne University**, Albert L. Schneider; **Elmhurst College**, E. Heyse Dummer; **Eureka College**, Raymond G. Aylsworth; **University of Florida**, C. B. Pollard; **Fordham University**, Emmanuel Chapman; **Georgetown University**, Henry M. O'Bryan, Franklin B. Williams; **University of Georgia**, William O. Collins, Jennie B. Smith, James A. Spruill, Jr.; **Hamilton College**, Henry Janzen; **Hunter College**, Ellen E. Brennan, Margaretha M. Brohmer, Dorothy K. Gorman, Liam O'Connor; **University of Idaho**, George Stump; **Illinois State Teachers College (Eastern)**, Eugene K. Asbury; **Intermountain Union College**, Arthur Seebart; **Johns Hopkins University**, Ludwig Edelstein; **University of Kansas City**, Raymond G. Stone; **Fort Hays Kansas State College**, Celesta Wine, Fritz Moore; **Kent State University**, C. Stanley Corey, John F. Cuber, Susanne M. Koehler, Elizabeth A. Leggett, Edna R. Lotz, Emma J. Olson, Marion Van Campen; **Louisiana State University**, Conrad A. Albrizio, Horace J. Davis, Duncan Ferguson, William B. Hatcher, Henry C. Lanpher, Charles S. McCleskey, Edward Ott, James C. Rice, Richard H. Wiggins; **Loyola University (New Orleans)**, Richard D. Doyle; **Marshall College**, A. E. McCaskey, Harry Mueller, Eugene M. Simons, John L. Stender; **University of Maryland**, Gwendolyn Drew, Alpheus R. Marshall, Paul E. Smith; **Western Maryland College**, Margaret Herring; **Michigan State College**, Merrill E. Deters, Merrill C. Gay, Alma M. Goetsch, Carl A. Hoppert, Ray Hutson, Raymond T. Ohl, Curtis W. Sabrosky, George Steinmetz, Orion Ulrey; **University of Michigan**, William Burt, Frank Copley, Arthur Smithies; **University of Minnesota**, Charles W. Boardman, Clyde Christensen, Carl Eide, Josephine C. Foster, William F. Geddes, C. Alexander Hodson, Edward G. Jennings, Fred L. Kildow, John A. Sanford, Ian W. Tervet, Russell I. Thackrey, Marjorie H. Thurston; **Mississippi State College**, Edmund L. King; **Missouri State Teachers College (Northeast)**, V. Don Hudson, Willis J. Bray, Wray M. Rieger, Agnes B. Slemons, Frank H. Trimble, Nan E. Wade, Bailey Wright; **University of Missouri**, C. M. Tucker; **Murray State Teachers College**, Forrest C. Pogue, Jr., George C. Poret; **New Jersey State Teachers College (Newark)**, Mary Bartlett; **North Carolina Teachers College (East)**, Martin L. Wright; **Northwestern University**, Barry Anson; **Ohio State University**, Harold P. Knauss; **Municipal University of Omaha**, Cristóbal S. Espinosa, Dayton E. Heckman, William K. Noyce, Dana T. Warren; **University of Oregon**, Homer H. Hanna; **Pennsylvania State College**, James Andes; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Indiana)**, Thomas Smyth; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (Lock Haven)**, William R. North; **University of Pennsylvania**, David Jeremiah, William N. Loucks; **University of Pittsburgh**, Harry W. Karn, Charles G. King, Mary V. Louden; **Princeton University**, Albert W. Tucker, Raymond S. Willis, Jr.; **Purdue University**, Laird Bell, J. William Robinson; **University of Rochester**, Frank P. Smith; **Rollins College**, William L. Roney; **Russell Sage College**, Frances Mauck; **St. Francis College (Pennsylvania)**, Leighton Brown; **Simmons College**, Marion B. Gardner; **Smith College**, Edith Burnett; **Southern**

Methodist University, Kenneth L. Palmquist; **Swarthmore College**, Hans Wallach; **Sweet Briar College**, Florence S. Hague; **Syracuse University**, Clinton W. Root, Robert C. Sedgwick; **Temple University**, Paul H. Kratz, George Weltner; **Tennessee State Teachers College (Middle)**, Thomas J. Golightly, H. Thompson Straw; **University of Tennessee**, Harold C. Amick, R. E. Dunford, Wendell L. Gray, George M. Haslerud, Marion T. Lyndon; **Texas State Teachers College (East)**, Harry M. Lafferty; **Texas State Teachers College (Southwest)**, Cora Lay, John M. Roady; **Trinity University**, Charles J. Frederick; **Vassar College**, Grace M. Hopper, Elizabeth J. Magers; **Wayne University**, Julia M. Hubbard, Donald H. Palmer; **West Virginia University**, Alden W. Thompson; **Whitworth College**, Otto G. Bachimont, Francis T. Hardwick, Leslie R. Hedrick, B. C. Neustel, Arthur E. Uhe; **Williams College**, Max Lerner; **Wilson Teachers College**, Mildred C. Stoler, M. Margaret Stroh; **Wisconsin State Teachers College (Oshkosh)**, Lawrence A. Oosterhous; **University of Wisconsin**, Cecelia Abry, Ray A. Brown; **University of Wyoming**, Henry Northern.

Junior

University of Chicago, David Speer; **University of Delaware**, Frank H. Mautner; **Louisiana State University**, Albert R. Erskine, Jr.; **University of Maryland**, James W. Coddington, Edwin Ghiselli, W. D. Patton, William Peden, Walter N. Volckhausen; **Minnesota State Teachers College (Duluth)**, Frank P. Bourgin; **University of Minnesota**, Stephen B. Humphrey, William E. Morris, Martin Rogin; **Scripps College**, Fritz Caspari; **Seton Hall College**, Edward F. Kennelly; **Southern Methodist University**, G. Geoffrey Langsam; **University of Tennessee**, Paul M. Pitts, Jr.; **Texas State Teachers College (Southwest)**, Ruby Henderson, Homer U. Miles; **University of Wyoming**, Paul Karl, Hugh B. McFadden; **Xavier University**, Edgar V. Meyer; **Not In University Connection**, James M. Miller (Ph.D., Pennsylvania State), Waynesburg, Pa.

Members Elected

The Committee on Admissions announces the election of 257 Active and 32 Junior members as follows:

Active

Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Isaac S. McAdory; **University of Alabama**, Helen Bosard, John M. Bruhn, Gladys E. Knight; **University of Arkansas**, Rudyard K. Bent, Virgil D. Cover, Paul W. Milam; **Baylor University**, John T. Summerhill; **Boston University**, Biagio Di Venuti, George Levene; **Bowling Green State University**, Florence Litchfield; **Brooklyn College**, Hans Rosenberg, Louise M. Rosenblatt, Hildegard Wichert; **Carnegie Institute of Technology**, Robert G. Simpson; **Carroll College (Wisconsin)**, Dorothy Richard-

son; Centenary College of Louisiana, Irma Broadwell, Don Brown, Mabel Campbell, Elizabeth Davidson, John B. Entrikin, Elmer L. Ford, W. Darrell Overdyke, Arthur M. Shaw, Robert E. Smith, Stewart A. Steger, Mary Lou Ware, Mary Warters; University of Cincinnati, Jessie L. Paul; The City College (New York), Raymond E. Lisle, Charles H. Poge; Coe College, Myron L. Koenig; Colgate University, Alfred S. Brown; University of Colorado, Ralph L. Crosman; Columbia University, G. Marshall Kay, Jesse H. Newlon, Geroid T. Robinson; Connecticut State College, John H. Marchant; Cornell College, Niel A. Miner; Cornell University, M. Lovell Hulse, Whiton Powell; Creighton University, Edwin Puls; Drew University, Dorr Diefendorf; Duke University, Ray C. Petry, James D. Poteat; Duquesne University, Earl P. Guth; Emory University, John E. Tilford, Jr.; College of Pharmacy of Ferris Institute, Simon Benson; Findlay College, Martica Georg; Fordham University, Francis Downing, William Frasca, John R. Hart, John Redden, Joseph R. Sherlock; Fresno State College, George H. Hunting, Paul V. Sheehan; George Washington University, William R. Compton; University of Georgia, Walter Coutu, Rhoda Permenter, Rufus H. Snyder, Andrew E. Terry, Kenneth R. Williams; Harvard University, Otto Oldenberg, Theodore Spencer; Hastings College, Vernon B. Fleharty; University of Hawaii, Harold J. Hofflich; Henderson State Teachers College, John A. Hamilton, Mary E. Marshall; Hunter College, Florence Brumbaugh, Mary S. Epstein, Marjorie L. Langenbahn, Anne S. Loop, Madge M. McKinney, Jean T. Wilde; Illinois College, Frederic B. Oxtoby; Illinois State Normal University, Kenyon S. Fletcher, Howard J. Hancock, Clifford E. Horton, Edward R. Johnson; Illinois State Normal University (Southern), Victor Randolph, Grace Wilhelm; Illinois State Teachers College (Eastern), Donald R. Alter; Intermountain Union College, Lincoln J. Aikens, Theron O. Odlaug; Jamestown College, Foster Y. St. Clair; John B. Stetson University, Charles B. Vance; Kansas State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, Fred L. Parrish; Kansas State Teachers College (Pittsburg), Jacob Uhrich; University of Kansas City, Madeline Ashton, Leslie L. Eisenbrandt, Henry G. Hilken, C. DeWitt Norton; University of Kentucky, Wendell E. Beals, William F. Gallaway, Marshall D. Ketchum, Roy Moreland, Frank H. Randall, W. Gayle Starnes; Lake Forest College, Karl A. Roth; Louisiana State University, R. E. Arne, Fred G. Brazda, William H. Carter, Albert E. Casey, Rudolf Heberle, William A. Lawrence, Mary E. Loup, Lewis B. Lucky, J. R. Shoptaugh, Harley Smith, Margarete Teer; Luther College, C. R. Waldeland; Marshall College, Mary Ann Williamson; University of Maryland, Carl S. Joslyn; Western Maryland College, Lawrence C. Little; Michigan State College, Herbert C. Beeskow, Donald O. Buell, Richard A. Fennell, Lloyd H. Geil; University of Michigan, Norman H. Anning; University of Minnesota, William P. Dunn; Mississippi State College, William J. Evans, Newton F. Hamlin, John F. Locke, Norman M. McCorkle, Robert C. Weems, Jr.; Missouri State Teachers College (Southeast), Martha Shea; University of Missouri, Norma Leavitt; Monmouth College, Milton M. Maynard, Ruth M. Williams; Mount Holyoke College, Hildegard Stücklen; Murray State Teachers College, William E. Derryberry,

Beatrice Frye, Charles Hire, Clifton S. Lowry, Gordon B. Pennebaker, A. M. Wolfson; **Nebraska State Teachers College (Wayne)**, Lenore P. Ramsey; **Newark College of Engineering**, Odd Albert; **University of North Carolina**, Lancaster D. Burling; **Northwestern University**, Albert A. Campbell; **Ohio State University**, Herbert Edwards, Joseph H. Gourley, Louis E. Rath, Ralston C. Thompson, Charles L. Williams, David C. Williams; **Ohio University**, Margaret Hampel; **Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Sherman M. Kuhn, Matthew W. Rosa, Eleroy L. Stromberg; **Municipal University of Omaha**, Nell M. Ward; **Oregon State College**, D. Thomas Ordeman, Lloyd E. West; **University of Oregon**, A. Halfred Young; **Pennsylvania State College**, Leslie E. Dills, Laura W. Drummond, George W. Henninger; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (West Chester)**, Thelma Greenwood, Mary Holland, Thelma Mellien, Josephine E. Wilson; **University of Pennsylvania**, W. Carlton Harris, Hobart S. Perry; **Purdue University**, Howard M. Baldwin, Richard Crowder, Albert R. Fulton, William Hastings, John R. Lindsay; **Reed College**, Marcus D. O'Day; **St. Joseph's College (Pennsylvania)**, Alfred H. Weber; **St. Louis University**, J. Manuel Espinosa, Norbert Furst; **Santa Barbara State College**, Harry Girvetz; **Seton Hall College**, George W. King, Jr.; **Seton Hill College**, John Hugo, Helen V. Irwin; **Simmons College**, Jessie M. Stuart, Caroline Holt; **Northern State Teachers College (South Dakota)**, Ruth Allen, Charles E. Booth, Lida M. Williams; **University of South Dakota**, H. C. Eyster, Thomas C. Geary, Ella Lokken; **University of Southern California**, Willard G. Smith, Robert E. Vivian; **Springfield College**, Leonard A. Larson; **Swarthmore College**, John W. Nason; **Syracuse University**, Reginald D. Manwell, Joseph A. Russell, Burton W. Taylor; **Temple University**, W. Edward Chamberlain, Elden S. Magaw, David F. M. Ulrich; **Tennessee State Teachers College (Middle)**, Neal D. Frazier; **University of Tennessee**, Kenneth Curry; **Texas State College for Women**, F. L. McDonald, Carl Wieseemann; **Texas State Teachers College (Southwest)**, M. L. Arnold, Carroll L. Key, J. Lloyd Rogers, Hugh F. Seabury, John H. Vordenbaum, Dallas S. Williams; **University of Texas**, G. Lowell Field; **Thiel College**, John B. Stoeber; **Tufts College**, Lewis F. Manly, Frederic N. Weaver; **University of Tulsa**, Claude A. Levensgood; **Ursinus College**, Everett M. Bailey; **Utah State Agricultural College**, Halbert Greaves, Leon B. Linford, Vance H. Tingey; **Vassar College**, Clarence A. Brodeur; **University of Vermont**, Roy J. Wietz; **Villanova College**, Anthony J. Lamberti, John A. McClain; **Western Washington College of Education**, Ruth A. Burnet, Donald G. Bushell, Moyle F. Cederstrom, Jack C. Cotton, Marjorie E. Dawson, Irene M. Elliott, Victor H. Hoppe, Evelyn Odom, Ruth E. Platt, Hazel J. Plympton, Charlotte B. Richardson, Evelyn A. Rupert, Leona Sundquist, E. Wilma Trent, Anna Ullin, Elsie A. Wendling; **University of Washington**, Siri Andrews, Kenneth C. Cole, Verne F. Ray; **West Virginia University**, James B. Lowther; **Western Reserve University**, Blanche Harvey, Helen M. Jordan, Benjamin R. Simpson, Eleanor Yeakel; **Westminster College (Pennsylvania)**, Virginia Everett; **College of William and Mary (Norfolk Division)**, Calder S. Sherwood III, Edward L. White; **Williams College**,

Robert R. R. Brooks, Alfred G. Emslie, Roy Lamson, Jr., Samuel A. Matthews, William B. Willcox; **Wilson Teachers College**, Paul O. Carr, Mary S. Cookson, Anna D. Halberg, Ellis Haworth, Ralph B. Kennard; **Wisconsin State Teachers College (LaCrosse)**, Marie Park; **College of Wooster**, Lawrence C. Boles, E. Kingman Eberhart.

Transfers from Junior to Active

University of Alabama, Henry L. Andrews, J. Russell Boner, Wilson Doyle, Franklin J. Foster, Eunice Jenkins; **Allegheny College**, Louis C. Green; **Arizona State Teachers College (Tempe)**, Arnold Tilden; **University of Arizona**, Albert I. Coleman; **University of Arkansas**, Dwight Dorrough; **University of Arkansas (Medical School)**, Ural S. Ashworth, William J. Darby, Paul E. Ross; **Ashland College**, George H. Donges; **Baldwin-Wallace College**, Louis W. Norris; **Ball State Teachers College**, Eldon R. Burke; **Berea College**, Ruth Woods; **Bethany College (West Virginia)**, Neil H. Graham; **Brooklyn College**, Jacob G. Sharefkin; **Bucknell University (Wilkes-Barre)**, Barbara A. Ryerson, Norma C. Sanguiliano; **California Institute of Technology**, Hardin Craig, Jr., Archibald Young; **University of California (Berkeley)**, William Berrien, Woodbridge Bingham, James D. Hart; **Canisius College**, Osmond E. Palmer; **Catholic University of America**, Allan H. Fry; **Central Y. M. C. A. College**, Warren W. Wood; **University of Chicago**, G. Frederic Kuder; **University of Cincinnati**, Edwin T. Miller, Mortimer Powell; **The Citadel**, Tate Lindsey; **Colgate University**, J. Calvin Keene; **Culver-Stockton College**, Eugene Elkins; **Dakota Wesleyan University**, Carl L. Barlow, Hervey D. Hotchkiss, Virginia R. Purinton; **University of Delaware**, George D. Hocking, Walter C. Wilson; **University of Detroit**, Peter S. Presta; **Drake University**, Paul Barrus, David Lynch, Alfred L. Severson; **Duquesne University**, Martin B. Fallon, Francis Kleyle, Howard J. Leahy; **Eureka College**, Walter G. Inman, C. W. Robertson; **Findlay College**, George E. Dodds, Harry Sarkiss, Jr.; **Florida State College for Women**, Lillian C. Canfield, Royal Mattice; **University of Florida**, Marcus G. Brown; **Fordham University**, William T. Farley; **Franklin and Marshall College**, W. Nelson Francis; **Fresno State College**, Earl D. Lyon; **George Washington University**, Edward C. Acheson, Howard M. Merriman; **Georgia School of Technology**, R. Kenneth Jacobs; **Georgia State College for Women**, Edward Dawson, William T. Knox; **Gettysburg College**, H. Rees Mitchell; **Goucher College**, Marie L. Edel; **Grove City College**, Dale Dreisbach; **Harvard University**, Edward Y. Hartshorne; **Hobart College**, John C. Adams, Burton E. Martin, Carl B. Taylor; **Hollins College**, Kathryn Wood; **Hood College**, Dorothy M. Greey; **Howard College**, Oliver Sarosi; **University of Idaho**, Milton C. Albrecht, Ester Segner, Louise Stedman; **Illinois State Normal University**, Mildred Kerr; **Illinois State Normal University (Southern)**, Harry Brainard, Van A. Buboltz, Hal Hall, Melvin J. Segal; **Illinois State Teachers College (Northern)**, Sylvia Resnikow; **University of Illinois**, John R. Frey, Willard Harrell, Glenn R. Negley, Charles E. Odegard; **Indiana University**, Robert

G. Stephens; **Iowa State College**, Arthur C. Bunce, Philip Carpenter, Holly Fryer, Gerhard Tintner, Ruth Wheeler; **Istanbul Woman's College**, Dorothy Dumble; **Kansas State College**, Daniel T. Sigley; **University of Kansas City**, Ernest Manheim; **University of Kentucky**, Hollis P. Guy; **Lafayette College**, Paul R. David; **Limestone College**, Bernice Mitchell; **Lincoln University**, Sidney J. Reedy; **Southwestern Louisiana Institute**, Lea L. Seale; **Louisiana State Normal College**, Eugene P. Watson; **Louisiana State University**, Peveril Meigs, III; **Loyola University (Illinois)**, William T. Supple; **University of Maryland**, Clarence J. Wittler; **Mills College**, Elliot Van Diller; **University of Minnesota**, Gaylord W. Anderson, Richard T. Arnold, Eleanor O. Barnes, Paul P. Merritt, Joseph K. Park, Edgar L. Piret, Clarence W. Tow, Henry H. Villard; **Missouri State Teachers College (Northwest)**, Frank Horsfall, Jr., Sterling Surrey; **Missouri State Teachers College (Southeast)**, Louise M. Gross; **Missouri State Teachers College (Southwest)**, John E. Webb; **Morehead State Teachers College**, Rienzi W. Jennings, Thomas D. Young; **Mount Holyoke College**, Alice B. Critchett; **New Mexico State College**, Margaret P. Boddy; **Ohio State University**, Norman F. Childers, David W. Lattimer; **Ohio University**, Gifford Blyton, Francis P. Bundy, Donald E. Church, Herschel Gier, Mary K. Leonard, F. Theodore Paige, Walter C. Richardson, Josephine Snook; **Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Jessie C. Griffin; **Oklahoma State Teachers College (Northwestern)**, Julia R. Spicer; **University of Oklahoma**, Marie Banks, Allen Belden, Arthur Hemmendinger, Barre Hill, Alice Sowers; **Oregon State College**, Howard W. Raabe; **University of Oregon**, O. Robert Anderson, John G. Reid; **Pennsylvania State College**, Doris M. Unsworth; **University of Rochester**, Arthur M. Hanhardt, Ludwig W. Kahn; **Rockford College**, Leslie A. Koempel; **St. Francis College (Pennsylvania)**, Alvin Sugar; **St. John's University**, Leigh B. Hanes; **St. Louis University**, Wolfgang Born, John V. Tillman; **Simmons College**, Anne M. Kendall; **Sioux Falls College**, Joseph E. Nuquist; **Skidmore College**, Irene Carn, Nellie Torrance, Charlotte Wieghard; **Smith College**, Marie Schneiders; **University of South Dakota**, Maurice H. Irvine, Bert J. Loewenberg, Paul Parker; **Swarthmore College**, Richard B. Brandt; **Temple University**, Donald M. Berwick, Edward M. Burchard; **University of Tennessee**, James A. Cooley; **Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas**, A. B. Nelson, William A. Owens, Alexander H. Sakowitz, Henry J. Welge; **Texas Technological College**, Haskell G. Taylor; **University of Texas**, Nathaniel Coburn, J. Chesley Mathews; **Thiel College**, Joseph A. Mastronie; **University of Toledo**, Morlin Bell; **Tulane University**, Ruth C. Lawson; **University of Tulsa**, E. Harry Criswell, Charles H. Fay, J. Charles Klotz; **Union University**, Theodore H. Eaton, Jr., Jermain D. Porter; **University of Utah**, Leo G. Provost; **Washington and Jefferson College**, Raymond M. Bell; **State College of Washington**, Lyndon U. Pratt, Ernest Samuels, Carl W. Sharsmith; **Wayne University**, Buford L. Pickens; **College of William and Mary**, Alfred R. Armstrong, Leslie Cheek, Jr., Leonard Haber, Edwin C. Rust; **Winthrop College**, Elizabeth L. Harris; **University of Wyoming**, Boyd G. Carter, Katherine Y. Sanborn; **Xavier University**, William H. Holmes.

Junior

Boston University, Lindsay Cleveland; Centenary College of Louisiana, Lucile A. Tindol; Cornell University, Clark M. McBurney; Creighton University, Robert E. Hanna; Duquesne University, Charles R. Davies; Emory University, Howard M. Phillips; Franklin and Marshall College, Clifford Marburger; Hastings College, Charles J. Thurmond; Louisiana State University, Jean Deval, Alan D. Grinsted; Marshall College, Neil D. Richmond; University of Minnesota, Bess Dworsky, Edward W. Hamilton; Missouri State Teachers College (Southeast), William A. Mueller; University of New Mexico, Walter Keller; Northwestern University, Edwin J. Lewis; Pacific University, Gerald W. Breese; University of Pennsylvania, James R. Hibbs; Purdue University, Jay W. Wiley; Reed College, Demorest Davenport, Douwe Stuurman; St. Lawrence University, Frank W. Yeaw; St. Louis University, Guy G. Harper, Joseph F. Sharpe, James Wade; Scripps College, Wyndham M. Southgate; Northern State Teachers College (South Dakota), Stella Yates; University of Tennessee, Frank Harrison; Washburn College, Gertrude Ullman; Westminster College (Missouri), Chester Alexander; Williams College, Philip H. Coombs; Not in University Connection, Roland C. Burton (M. A., Illinois), Trenton, N. J.